arXiv:1411.6252v1 [math.NA] 23 Nov 2014

Discretizing the transcritical and pitchfork bifurcations—conjugacy results

Lajos Lóczi
lloczi@cs.elte.hu
Department of Numerical Analysis
Eötvös Loránd University
Pázmány P. sétány 1/C, Budapest, H-1117, Hungary*†

November 25, 2014

Abstract

We present two case studies in one-dimensional dynamics concerning the discretization of transcritical (TC) and pitchfork (PF) bifurcations. In the vicinity of a TC or PF bifurcation point and under some natural assumptions on the one-step discretization method of order $p \geq 1$, we show that the time-h exact and the step-size-h discretized dynamics are topologically equivalent by constructing a two-parameter family of conjugacies in each case. As a main result, we prove that the constructed conjugacy maps are $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$-close to the identity and these estimates are optimal.

1 Introduction

Let us consider a one-dimensional ordinary differential equation

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), \alpha) \tag{1}$$

depending on a scalar bifurcation parameter $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that a one-step discretization of (1) is given by

$$X_{n+1} := \varphi(h, X_n, \alpha), \qquad n \in \mathbb{N} \equiv \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}, \tag{2}$$

where $h > 0$ denotes the step-size of the method $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ of order $p \in \mathbb{N}^+$, and sufficient smoothness is assumed on both $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and φ. We suppose that (1) undergoes either a transcritical or a pitchfork bifurcation at parameter value $\alpha = 0$ with the bifurcating equilibrium located at $x = 0$. Let $\Phi(h, \cdot, \alpha) : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ denote the time-h-map of the exact solution flow induced by (1) at parameter value α. Then, by the definition of the order of the numerical method, we have

$$|\Phi(h, x, \alpha) - \varphi(h, x, \alpha)| \leq const \cdot h^{p+1}, \quad \forall\, h \in [0, h_0], \forall\, |x| \leq \varepsilon_0, \forall\, |\alpha| \leq \alpha_0 \tag{3}$$

with some positive constants *const*, h_0, ε_0 and α_0, depending on f and φ.

*The project was supported by the European Union and co-financed by the European Social Fund (grant agreement no. TAMOP 4.2.1/B-09/1/KMR-2010-0003). Support from Award No. FIC/2010/05 – 2000000231 made by King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST) is also acknowledged.

†The final version of this manuscript is to appear in *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications*

A fundamental task in numerical analysis is to compare the exact dynamics with the discretized one, that is, the discrete dynamical systems generated by the iterates of Φ and φ, respectively, both from a qualitative and a quantitative point of view. Let us recall some specific previous results in this direction which served as a direct motivation for our present work.

The case when $\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t))$ has a hyperbolic equilibrium has been solved satisfactorily. It has been proved that one-step methods faithfully reproduce the phase portrait near hyperbolic equilibria in the following sense: the time-h-map of the exact dynamics and the step-size-h-map of the discretized dynamics are conjugate—i.e., there exists a C^0 (and in general) non-linear coordinate transformation between them—moreover, the conjugacy map can be chosen to be $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$-close to the identity. This type of result can be recast by saying that the original system is numerically structurally stable.

A natural next step is to investigate the relationship between exact and discretized dynamics when hyperbolicity is violated, for example, in the context of bifurcating one-parameter families of ODEs, like (1). Simple examples show that the original dynamics and its discretization need not be conjugate near a general non-hyperbolic equilibrium. Nevertheless, by extending some earlier results, we showed in [5] that the time-h-map of the exact dynamics and the step-size-h-map of the discretized dynamics are again conjugate in a neighborhood of a fold bifurcation point. In addition, we proved optimal $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$-closeness results in the $\alpha \leq 0$ region where the two branches of fixed points are located and merge at $(\alpha, x) = (0, 0)$; in the fixed-point-free $\alpha > 0$ region however we only managed to get either a singular $\mathcal{O}(h^p \,|\ln \alpha|)$ or a $\mathcal{O}(h)$ estimate between the conjugacy map J and the identity id, depending on the construction of J. A detailed proof of the $\alpha \leq 0$ case is given in [5], while a proof of the singular estimate is published in [11]. Therefore, although numerical structural stability has been established, the problem of optimal conjugacy estimates in the fold bifurcation case is still open.

1.1 An outlook to the relevant literature

There is a rich literature on connections between discretizations and bifurcations. The interested reader will find a selection of about 50 references on this topic in our recent work [11]. Let us add that the above brief summary in the previous paragraphs is also put into a wider context in [11], including the notion of structural and numerical structural stability with earlier important results under various hyperbolicity conditions; references on the properties of numerical methods near bifurcation points of ODEs together with convergence questions; earlier proofs on the discretized fold bifurcation; finally, several theorems on other types of discretized bifurcations of codimension 1, 2 or higher, in 1 or N dimensions, and comparisons between the corresponding bifurcation diagrams, critical eigenvectors or normal form coefficients. These last results are more general, but weaker than conjugacy results. To the best of our knowledge, conjugacy results in a non-hyperbolic setting have only been obtained for the fold bifurcation.

1.2 The main results of the present paper

The purpose of the present work is to establish conjugacy results for the TC and PF bifurcations. These results are based on the author's thesis [10]. We show that in a neighborhood of a TC or PF point the original system (1) is not numerically structurally stable if arbitrary one-step methods are considered, but when the allowed φ discretizations are suitably restricted to a certain class (containing all Runge–Kutta methods, for example), then numerical structural stability is recovered near TC and PF points, too. More specifically, we prove in the TC and PF cases that for any fixed h and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ (with $h > 0$ and $|\alpha|$ sufficiently small) and under some

natural assumptions on φ, there is a solution $J(h,\cdot,\alpha)$ to the conjugacy equation

$$J(h,\Phi(h,x,\alpha),\alpha)=\varphi(h,J(h,x,\alpha),\widetilde{\alpha}), \tag{4}$$

with $\alpha\mapsto\widetilde{\alpha}$ $(=\widetilde{\alpha}(h))$ being a homeomorphism and $|\alpha-\widetilde{\alpha}|=\mathcal{O}(h^p)$.[1] We remark that aligning the bifurcation parameter α with $\widetilde{\alpha}$ in this functional equation (4) is usually necessary, since numerical methods may shift the original bifurcation point $x=0\in\mathbb{R}$. It is also important that the constructed homeomorphism $J(h,\cdot,\alpha)$ is defined on a fixed, non-shrinking neighborhood (being independent of the parameters as $h\to 0^+$ or $\alpha\to 0$) of the point $x=0$. Beyond the above results we prove in both cases that the distance between the identity map and the constructed conjugacy satisfies an

$$|id-J(h,\cdot,\alpha)|=\mathcal{O}(h^p)$$

closeness estimate, and this estimate is optimal in h.

1.3 The organization of the paper

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 1.4 summarizes our notation. The TC bifurcation is treated in Section 2.1 (giving an overview of the results) and in Section 3 (containing the detailed proofs). In Section 2.1, the defining conditions for the TC bifurcation are first analyzed together with our assumptions on the discretization φ. Necessity of these assumptions is illustrated by an example. The normal forms of Φ and φ and their closeness relations are discussed next. With the help of these normal forms and the corresponding fundamental domains, the construction of the conjugacy map is sketched. Section 2.1 then concludes with our main theorem on the TC conjugacy estimates. The detailed construction of the conjugacy is actually presented in Section 3.1, proving topological equivalence between the original time-h-map and its discretized counterpart. The quantitative Sections 3.2–3.4 deal with the optimality of the $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$ estimates first, then with the explicit conjugacy estimates in the inner and outer regions in the (α,x)-plane, respectively. As for the PF bifurcation, the arrangement of the material is analogous. Section 2.2 gives a summary of our results in the PF case, Section 4.1 describes the construction of the conjugacy in detail, while Sections 4.2–4.4 contain the optimal $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$ PF closeness estimates. Finally in Section 5, we provide a numerical example demonstrating the closeness estimates in the TC case, and mention some open questions about a possible generalization of the above results to higher dimensions.

1.4 Notation

The floor and ceiling functions are $\lfloor\cdot\rfloor$ and $\lceil\cdot\rceil$, as usual. For a, $b\in\mathbb{R}$, $[\{a,b\}]$ is the closed interval generated by the set $\{a,b\}$, that is $[\{a,b\}]:=[\min(a,b),\max(a,b)]$.

The k^{th} iterate ($k\in\mathbb{Z}$) of a real function g is denoted by $g^{[k]}$. When k is negative, g is assumed to be invertible, so, for example, $g^{[-1]}$ denotes the inverse function of g.

By "smooth function" we mean a C^k function (in all variables) with sufficiently large $k\in\mathbb{N}^+$ and with the last derivative bounded.

The normal form of $\Phi(h,\cdot,\alpha)$ is denoted by $\mathcal{N}_\Phi(h,\cdot,\alpha)$, while $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(h,\cdot,\alpha)$ denotes the normal form of $\varphi(h,\cdot,\alpha)$. Iterates of one of the normal forms with suitable starting values will define the real sequences x_n, y_n or z_n, used in the definition of the fundamental domains (their dependence on h and α is often suppressed however).

The symbols $\omega_{\Phi,-}$, $\omega_{\Phi,0}$ and $\omega_{\Phi,+}$ stand for certain fixed points of the maps $\Phi(h,\cdot,\alpha)$ (or, of the $\mathcal{N}_\Phi(h,\cdot,\alpha)$ normal forms). These fixed points may depend on h and α. The meaning of $\omega_{\varphi,-}$, $\omega_{\varphi,0}$ and $\omega_{\varphi,+}$ is analogous.

[1] Throughout the article, the constants in the $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$ symbols are independent of x and α.

As already mentioned earlier, $h_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $\alpha_0 > 0$ are (small) positive constants, depending on f and φ. Some restrictions on their values will be given later. The particular positive constant in the estimate of the distance of the normal forms is denoted by c (see (21) and (32)). It is independent of h, x and α, and its value is fixed within Section 3 or 4. A generic positive constant (independent of h, x and α) is denoted by *const*. It may denote different positive numbers at different occurrences. We will use K to denote a positive uniform bound on the moduli of the functions η_3, $\widetilde{\eta}_3$ or η_4, $\widetilde{\eta}_4$ together with their first and second derivatives. These η functions will appear in the tails of the normal forms. The value of K is assumed to be fixed within Section 3 or 4.

Various (mixed) partial derivatives with respect to the corresponding variables are denoted by f_x, $f_{x\alpha}$, and so on. We use superscript ^{E} for function evaluation at general (but fixed) parameter values h and α, so J^E, for example, abbreviates the function $J(h,\cdot,\alpha)$, while evaluation at the bifurcation point is denoted by the ^{B} operator: f_x^B, for example, stands for $f_x(0,0)$.

Finally, let us call the reader's attention to a slight notational incompatibility in bifurcation theory regarding the order of variables: bifurcation diagrams are usually depicted in the (α, x)-plane, however, as arguments of a function, the variable x generally precedes the bifurcation parameter α.

2 Main Results

2.1 The TC case

Suppose that the origin $(x,\alpha) = (0,0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is an equilibrium as well as a transcritical bifurcation point for (1), that is, the following conditions hold:

$$f(0,\alpha) = 0, \quad \forall\, |\alpha| \le \alpha_0, \tag{5a}$$

$$f_x^B = 0, \quad f_{xx}^B \neq 0, \quad f_{x\alpha}^B \neq 0. \tag{5b}$$

Remark 2.1 *Besides (5), there are other ways to formulate the TC conditions in one dimension for differential equations. Similarly, various sets of conditions can be given for maps guaranteeing the appearance of a TC bifurcation. For a map $x \mapsto g(x,\alpha)$ to undergo a TC bifurcation near the origin, it is sufficient to have*

$$g(0,\alpha) = 0, \quad \forall\, |\alpha| \le \alpha_0, \tag{6}$$

$$g_x^B = 1, \quad g_{xx}^B \neq 0, \quad g_{x\alpha}^B \neq 0. \tag{7}$$

Notice that unlike conditions (7), (6) is not a point condition on g at the bifurcation point $(x,\alpha) = (0,0)$, so one can ask whether (6) can be relaxed. The answer is affirmative, but some care should be exercised. In [13], for example, instead of (6)–(7), the map g is simply required to satisfy

$$g^B = 0, \quad g_\alpha^B = 0, \quad g_x^B = 1, \quad g_{xx}^B \neq 0, \quad g_{x\alpha}^B \neq 0. \tag{8}$$

The argument in [13] tacitly assumes in addition that x can be factored out from g, and prove from these the presence of a TC-structure near the origin. However, the example $x_{n+1} := g(x_n,\alpha)$ with $g(x,\alpha) := \alpha^2 + (1+\alpha)x + x^2$ illustrates that (8) alone is insufficient to define a TC bifurcation: since $(x,\alpha) = (0,0)$ is the only fixed point of this map, clearly no TC bifurcation of fixed points can occur here. It is unfortunate that some other mathematical works, e.g., [3], or teaching materials also try to define the TC bifurcation imperfectly as (8). Nevertheless, TC bifurcation for maps can be guaranteed via point conditions only. In [6], for example, a discriminant condition is used: conditions

$$g^B = 0, \quad g_\alpha^B = 0, \quad g_x^B = 1, \quad g_{xx}^B \neq 0, \quad \left(g_{x\alpha}^B\right)^2 - g_{xx}^B \cdot g_{\alpha\alpha}^B > 0$$

imply the presence of a TC bifurcation near the origin. To complicate the matter a bit, [6] contains a typo (but the intended meaning is clear from the context): instead of the last $>$ inequality above, a "$\neq$" sign appears there. To summarize, conditions (5), or (6)–(7) we adopted are not the weakest ones, but they are simple and still retain all essential features of the problem. Finally, it is instructive to compare this remark with Remark 2.7. □

To ensure that the origin $x = 0$ is a fixed point also for the discretization map

$$x \mapsto \varphi(h, x, \alpha), \tag{9}$$

we assume that

$$\varphi(h, 0, \alpha) = 0 \tag{10}$$

holds for all sufficiently small $h \geq 0$ and $|\alpha|$. This condition is necessary for (9) to undergo a TC bifurcation near the origin, as illustrated by the following example.

Example 2.2 *Let us fix some $h > 0$. Suppose we have a map $\varphi(h, x, \alpha) := h^{2p+1} + (1 + h\alpha)x + hx^2$, violating (10), but satisfying (3) with $\Phi(h, x, \alpha) := (1 + h\alpha)x + hx^2$. This Φ undergoes a TC bifurcation near the origin, however, φ does not: its fixed points are given by $x_\pm = \frac{1}{2}\left(-\alpha \pm \sqrt{\alpha^2 - 4h^{2p}}\right)$, so the fixed-point branches of φ are separeted by the central $\alpha \in (-2h^p, 2h^p)$ strip.* □

Remark 2.3 *It is well-known that all Runge–Kutta methods preserve equilibria (see Lemma 2.12), hence (10) is automatically satisfied for these discretizations.* □

Now let us turn our attention to the solution of equation (4). Since it will be easier to construct J and prove the closeness estimates by working with some concrete normal forms instead of Φ and φ, we present two results about the structure of the normal forms for the maps $\Phi(h, \cdot, \alpha)$ and $\varphi(h, \cdot, \alpha)$ near the equilibrium being also a TC bifurcation point.

Lemma 2.4 *Suppose that $f \in C^{p+6}$ and (5) hold. Then there are smooth and invertible coordinate and parameter changes transforming the map $x \mapsto \Phi(h, x, \alpha)$ into*

$$\eta \mapsto (1 + h\beta)\eta + s \cdot h\eta^2 + h\eta^3 \cdot \eta_3(h, \eta, \beta),$$

where η_3 is a smooth function, and s is either 1 or -1 for all small values of $h \geq 0$ and $|\alpha|$.

Theorem 2.5 *Suppose that $f \in C^{p+6}$ and conditions (3), (5) and (10) hold with a sufficiently smooth φ. Then there are smooth and invertible coordinate and parameter changes transforming the map $x \mapsto \varphi(h, x, \alpha)$ into*

$$\widetilde{\eta} \mapsto (1 + h\widetilde{\beta})\widetilde{\eta} + s \cdot h\widetilde{\eta}^2 + h\widetilde{\eta}^3 \cdot \widetilde{\eta}_3(h, \widetilde{\eta}, \widetilde{\beta}),$$

where $\widetilde{\eta}_3$ is a smooth function, and s is either 1 or -1 for all small values of $h \geq 0$ and $|\alpha|$. Moreover, the smooth invertible coordinate and parameter changes above and those in Lemma 2.4 are $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$-close to each other, and

$$|\eta_3 - \widetilde{\eta}_3| \leq const \cdot h^p.$$

We omit the technical proofs of the above two results; they are given in [10]. The idea of their proofs is to follow the corresponding sections of [8] with h suitably built into the computations: the smoothness assumptions allow multivariate Taylor polynomials of Φ and φ with integral remainders to be constructed explicitly, then qualitative and quantitative inverse

and implicit function theorems (see, e.g., [11, Theorem 2.2]) are applied. We remark that the value of $s = \pm 1$ is the same in Lemma 2.4 and Theorem 2.5, and this sign is only responsible for the orientation of the bifurcation diagrams. For definiteness, from now on in this section and in Section 3, $s := 1$ is chosen.

Finally, [10] also proves that $|\beta - \widetilde{\beta}| \equiv |\beta(h,\alpha) - \widetilde{\beta}(h,\alpha)| \leq const \cdot h^p$, so we can apply a further parameter shift $\widetilde{\beta} \mapsto \beta$ in the normal form in Theorem 2.5, being $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$-close to the identity. This allows us to use the bifurcation parameter α again instead of β and $\widetilde{\beta}$. Moreover, as a notational simplification, we will write x instead of the dummy variables η and $\widetilde{\eta}$.

The above reductions imply that it is enough to solve the conjugacy equation (4) for the corresponding normal forms and with $\alpha = \widetilde{\alpha}$. This will be carried out in Section 3.1 by using the method of fundamental domains, see [8] also. The essence of this method is the following: for fixed h and α, $J(h,\cdot,\alpha)$ is prescribed on a suitable starting interval and then recursively extended by using rearrangements of (4) with $\alpha = \widetilde{\alpha}$. Near attractive fixed points, the fundamental domains are defined by forward iterates

$$x_{k+1}(h,\alpha) := \mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, x_k, \alpha) \quad (k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots) \tag{11}$$

of a suitable starting value x_0, while backward iterates are used near repelling fixed points. Some members of the sequences $x_k(h,\alpha)$ are illustrated in Figure 3. From the proposed construction in Section 3.1, it is easily seen that $J(h,\cdot,\alpha)$ is a homeomorphism locally near the origin, moreover, J is continuous in its first and third arguments as well.

After the conjugacy map has been constructed, estimating $|x - J(h,x,\alpha)|$ from above for $0 < h \leq h_0$, $|x| \leq \varepsilon_0$ and $|\alpha| \leq \alpha_0$ is much more involved. This is described in Sections 3.2–3.4.

Section 3.2 illustrates by simple examples that the distance of the fixed points of $\mathcal{N}_\Phi(h,\cdot,\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(h,\cdot,\alpha)$ can be bounded from below by $const(\alpha) \cdot h^p$. Since a conjugacy necessarily maps fixed points into fixed points, better estimates than $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$ for $|x - J(h,x,\alpha)|$ generally cannot be expected—at least in terms of h.

Then, by using the recursive definitions of the conjugacy, it turns out that for an $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$ closeness estimate, a discrete Gronwall-type estimate of the form

$$\left(h \sum_{k=0}^{n} |x_k|^\omega \left(\prod_{j=k}^{n} \left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi\right)_x (h, x_k, \alpha) \right) \right) \cdot h^p \leq const \cdot h^p \tag{12}$$

suffices, with $\omega = 3$, the sequence x_k defined by (11), and *const* being independent of $0 < h \leq h_0$, $|x| \leq \varepsilon_0$ and $|\alpha| \leq \alpha_0$. The difficulty in estimating the left-hand side of (12) is that the derivative of the normal form is approximately 1 and it is evaluated at an implicitly defined non-linear sequence x_k, so the contribution of the product is not easily established. At this point, a special family of non-linear recursions of T. Hüls [7] proved to be invaluable: for $a > 0$ and $0 < q \in \mathbb{N}$ arbitrary parameters and $z_0 > 0$ sufficiently small starting value, the closed form solution of

$$z_{n+1} := \frac{z_n}{(1 + aqz_n^q)^{1/q}} \quad (n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots) \tag{13}$$

is given by

$$z_n = \frac{z_0}{(1 + naqz_0^q)^{1/q}}.$$

This family of model functions coupled with the power of *Mathematica* made it possible to formulate our key lemmas Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.12, providing convergence speed estimates for the parametric sequence x_k and its "outer" counterpart z_k. Then Lemma 3.9 and Lemma 3.11 settle the closeness estimates in the inner region, while Section 3.4 in the outer region.

As a summary of these results concerning the TC case, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 2.6 *Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 2.5 hold. Then the conjugacy J (constructed in Section 3.1) satisfies closeness estimates that are optimal in h near the TC point: there exists a positive constant const > 0 such that for all $0 < h \le h_0$, $|x| \le \varepsilon_0$ and $|\alpha| \le \alpha_0$*

$$|\, x - J(h, x, \alpha)| \le const \cdot h^p. \tag{14}$$

Let us add finally that it is seen from the proofs that instead of $const \cdot h^p$ in the above closeness estimates, sometimes a better $const \cdot \alpha^\kappa\, h^p$ can be written with $\kappa \in \{1, 2\}$. Generally, the closer x lies to the fixed point branches, the larger κ one can choose.

2.2 The PF case

Suppose that the origin $(x, \alpha) = (0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is an equilibrium as well as a pitchfork bifurcation point for (1), that is, the following conditions hold:

$$f(0, \alpha) = 0, \quad \forall\, |\alpha| \le \alpha_0, \tag{15a}$$

$$f^B_x = 0, \quad f^B_{xx} = 0, \quad f^B_{xxx} \ne 0, \quad f^B_{x\alpha} \ne 0. \tag{15b}$$

Remark 2.7 *In this context, f is usually assumed to be odd, that is $f(x, \alpha) = -f(-x, \alpha)$ for $|x| \le \varepsilon_0$ and $|\alpha| \le \alpha_0$. The above asymmetric PF conditions (15) are thus weaker than the usual ones. If symmetry were assumed, then the normal form transformations in Lemma 2.14 and Theorem 2.15 below would be much easier. Symmetry, however, is not essential here. We remark that even (15) can be slightly weakened (cf. Remark 2.1). Regarding the PF conditions for maps, [13], for example, uses again only point conditions at the bifurcation point $(0, 0)$: unlike in the TC case, this time they are sufficient to define a PF near the origin, as shown by Theorem 2.8 below. Summarizing, similarly to the TC case, we have not adopted the most general conditions for a PF bifurcation in (15), nevertheless symmetry is not assumed.* □

Theorem 2.8 *Assume we have a smooth map $x \mapsto g(x, \alpha)$ defined near the origin $(0, 0)$ and depending smoothly also on α such that*

$$g(0,0) = 0,\ g_x(0,0) = 1,\ g_{xx}(0,0) = 0,\ g_{xxx}(0,0) \ne 0,\ g_\alpha(0,0) = 0,\ g_{x\alpha}(0,0) \ne 0,$$

$$g_{xxx}(0,0) \cdot g_{x\alpha}(0,0) > 0.$$

Then the map g undergoes a pitchfork bifurcation locally at the origin: g has precisely 3 branches of fixed points $\rho_0(\alpha)$ and $\rho_\pm(\alpha)$ with the following properties. There exist positive constants $c_0 > 0, c_2 > c_1 > 0$ and $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that

$$|\rho_0(\alpha)| \le c_0|\alpha| \quad \text{for } |\alpha| \le \alpha_0,$$

$$c_1|\alpha|^{1/2} \le \rho_+(\alpha) \le c_2|\alpha|^{1/2} \quad \text{for } -\alpha_0 \le \alpha < 0,$$

and

$$-c_2|\alpha|^{1/2} \le \rho_-(\alpha) \le -c_1|\alpha|^{1/2} \quad \text{for } -\alpha_0 \le \alpha < 0.$$

The case $g_{xxx}(0,0) \cdot g_{x\alpha}(0,0) < 0$ yields the "mirror-symmetrical" counterpart: there are three branches of fixed points for $\alpha > 0$ and a unique branch for $\alpha \le 0$ with similar estimates.

The elementary proof of the above theorem on asymmetric pitchfork bifurcations can be found in [10] and it is omitted here.

As a preparation for the normal form transformations for the maps $x \mapsto \Phi(h, x, \alpha)$ and

$$x \mapsto \varphi(h, x, \alpha) \tag{16}$$

near the equilibrium being also a PF bifurcation point, let us make the following considerations. To ensure that the origin $x = 0$ is a fixed point also for the discretization map (16), we assume that

$$\varphi(h, 0, \alpha) = 0 \tag{17}$$

holds for sufficiently small $h \geq 0$ and $|\alpha|$. We also suppose that

$$\varphi_x(h, 0, 0) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{xx}(h, 0, 0) = 0 \tag{18}$$

hold for all sufficiently small $h \geq 0$. These conditions are necessary and sufficient for (16) with property (3) to undergo a PF bifurcation near the origin. Necessity is illustrated by three examples below, while sufficiency is proved by the normal form transformations themselves.

Example 2.9 *Consider the map $\varphi(h, x, \alpha) := h^{3p+1} + (1 + h\alpha)x + hx^3$. For this φ, condition $\varphi(h, 0, \alpha) = 0$ does not hold, but φ satisfies (3) with $\Phi(h, x, \alpha) := (1 + h\alpha)x + hx^3$. This Φ has a PF bifurcation at the origin, φ however does not, see Figure 1.* □

Example 2.10 *Suppose now we have a map $\varphi(h, x, \alpha) := (1 + h\alpha)x + h^{p+1}x^2 + hx^3$. Clearly, φ violates condition $\varphi_{xx}(h, 0, 0) = 0$, but satisfies (3) with $\Phi(h, x, \alpha) := (1 + h\alpha)x + hx^3$. This φ does not have a PF near the origin, see Figure 1.* □

Example 2.11 *Suppose finally that the discretized map has the form $\varphi(h, x, \alpha) := (1 + h\alpha - h^{p+1})x + h\alpha x^2 + hx^3$. This φ does not satisfy $\varphi_x(h, 0, 0) = 1$, but is sufficiently close to $\Phi(h, x, \alpha) := (1 + h\alpha)x + h\alpha x^2 + hx^3$. It is easily seen that Φ has a PF at the origin, but φ does not, see Figure 2.* □

In the following lemma we prove that all Runge–Kutta methods satisfy the three requirements (17)–(18) above.

Lemma 2.12 *Suppose that $f^B = 0$, $f^B_x = 0$, $f^B_{xx} = 0$ and let φ be a general s-stage Runge–Kutta method with step-size h, that is*

$$\varphi(h, x, \alpha) := x + h \sum_{i=1}^{s} \gamma_i \cdot k_i(h, x, \alpha),$$

with each function k_i $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, s)$ satisfying the (implicit) equation

$$k_i(h, x, \alpha) = f(x + h \sum_{j=1}^{s} \beta_{i,j} \cdot k_j(h, x, \alpha), \alpha),$$

where γ_i and $\beta_{i,j}$ $(i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, s)$ are given real parameters. Then for every $h \geq 0$ sufficiently small, we have that $\varphi_x(h, 0, 0) = 1$ and $\varphi_{xx}(h, 0, 0) = 0$.

Proof. Since $f^B = 0$, from unique solvability we get for all i that $k_i(h, 0, 0) \equiv 0$, implying the well-known property (17). On the other hand, differentiating the implicit defining equation we get that

$$(k_i)_x(h, 0, 0) = \left(1 + h \sum_{j=1}^{s} \beta_{i,j} \, (k_j)_x(h, 0, 0)\right) \, f_x \left(h \sum_{j=1}^{s} \beta_{i,j} \, k_j(h, 0, 0), 0\right).$$



Figure 1: The solution of $\varphi(h, x, \alpha) = x$ from Example 2.9 (upper figure) and Example 2.10 (lower figure) with some fixed $h > 0$.



Figure 2: The solution of $\varphi(h, x, \alpha) = x$ from Example 2.11 (upper figure) with some fixed $h > 0$. The lower figure zooms in on the left half of the upper figure, showing that φ does not have a PF bifurcation.

But $k_j(h,0,0) \equiv 0$ and $f_x(0,0) = 0$, hence $(k_i)_x(h,0,0) \equiv 0$, so $\varphi_x(h,0,0) \equiv 1$.

Differentiating the defining equation again we see that

$$(k_i)_{xx}(h,0,0) = h \sum_{j=1}^{s} \beta_{i,j}\,(k_j)_{xx}(h,0,0)\, f_x\left(h \sum_{j=1}^{s} \beta_{i,j}\, k_j(h,0,0), 0\right) +$$

$$\left(1 + h \sum_{j=1}^{s} \beta_{i,j}\,(k_j)_x(h,0,0)\right)^2 f_{xx}\left(h \sum_{j=1}^{s} \beta_{i,j}\, k_j(h,0,0), 0\right),$$

but $f_x(0,0) = f_{xx}(0,0) = 0$, so $(k_i)_{xx}(h,0,0) \equiv 0$ and $\varphi_{xx}(h,0,0) \equiv 0$. $\square$

Remark 2.13 *It is remarkable that $f^B = 0$, $f^B_x = 0$ and $f^B_{xx} = 0$ imply many other vanishing quantities for Runge–Kutta methods. It can be proved in a similar, recursive fashion as above, that, for example,*

$$(k_i)_h(h,0,0) \equiv (k_i)_{hh}(h,0,0) \equiv (k_i)_{hx}(h,0,0) \equiv (k_i)_{hxx}(h,0,0) \equiv (k_i)_{hhxx}(h,0,0) \equiv 0.$$

These proofs require considerably more computations. A consequence, for example, is that

$$\varphi_{hx}(h,0,0) \equiv \varphi_{hhxx}(h,0,0) \equiv 0.$$

However, these latter two formulae—needed in the proof of Theorem 2.15 below—directly follow from (18) as well, so they hold not only for Runge–Kutta methods. $\square$

After these introductory remarks, let us present the actual PF normal forms. Since the PF conditions (15) are a special case of the corresponding TC conditions, we start the normal form transformation just as in the TC case (but truncate Taylor-expansion at fourth order instead of third).

Lemma 2.14 *Suppose that $f \in C^{p+7}$ and (15) hold. Then there are smooth and invertible coordinate and parameter changes transforming the map $x \mapsto \Phi(h,x,\alpha)$ into*

$$\eta \mapsto (1 + h\beta)\eta + s \cdot h\eta^3 + h\eta^4 \cdot \eta_4(h,\eta,\beta),$$

where η_4 is a smooth function, moreover, s is either 1 or -1 for all small values of $h \geq 0$ and $|\alpha|$.

Theorem 2.15 *Suppose that $f \in C^{p+7}$ and conditions (3), (15), (17) and (18) hold with a sufficiently smooth φ. Then there are smooth and invertible coordinate and parameter changes transforming the map*

$$x \mapsto \varphi(h,x,\alpha)$$

into

$$\widetilde{\eta} \mapsto (1 + h\widetilde{\beta})\widetilde{\eta} + s \cdot h\widetilde{\eta}^3 + h\widetilde{\eta}^4 \cdot \widetilde{\eta}_4(h,\widetilde{\eta},\widetilde{\beta}),$$

where $\widetilde{\eta}_4$ is a smooth function, and s is either 1 or -1 for all small values of $h \geq 0$ and $|\alpha|$. Moreover, the smooth invertible coordinate and parameter changes above and those in Lemma 2.14 are $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$-close to each other, and

$$|\eta_4 - \widetilde{\eta}_4| \leq const \cdot h^p.$$

The proofs of the above two results are again given in [10] and we omit them now (we just add that obtaining these PF normal forms by using the TC normal forms is still a non-trivial task). Here again the value of $s = \pm 1$ is the same in the above lemma and theorem, but now and in Section 4, the value $s := -1$ is chosen. Then, similarly to the TC case, we can apply a parameter shift $\widetilde{\beta} \mapsto \beta$, being $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$-close to the identity, implying that the bifurcation parameter α can be used instead of β and $\widetilde{\beta}$. To simplify the notation, we will write x instead of the dummy variables η and $\widetilde{\eta}$.

The above reductions again mean that it is enough to solve the conjugacy equation (4) for the corresponding normal forms and with $\alpha = \widetilde{\alpha}$. This is carried out in Section 4.1, again via the the method of fundamental domains defined by sequences like (11), of course, now with the corresponding PF normal form. It is again true that $J(h, \cdot, \alpha)$ is a homeomorphism locally near the origin, and J is continuous in its first and third variables as well.

Sections 4.2–4.4 then describe the conjugacy estimates in detail. In formula (12), we have $\omega = 4$ in the PF case. The key results on the convergence speed now are Lemmas 4.5 and 4.11.

As a conclusion, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 2.16 *Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 2.15 hold. Then the conjugacy J (constructed in Section 4.1) satisfies closeness estimates optimal in h near the PF point: there exists a positive constant const > 0 such that for all $0 < h \le h_0$, $|x| \le \varepsilon_0$ and $|\alpha| \le \alpha_0$*

$$|x - J(h, x, \alpha)| \le const \cdot h^p.$$

Similarly to the TC case, in some regions we have $const \cdot \alpha^\kappa\, h^p$ on the right-hand side with a suitable $\kappa = 1$ or $\kappa = 2$.

3 Conjugacy in the Discretized TC Bifurcation

3.1 Construction of the conjugacy in the TC case

According to Section 2.1, it is enough to define a conjugacy map between the corresponding normal forms, and these normal forms can be chosen as

$$\mathcal{N}_\Phi(h, x, \alpha) := (1 + h\alpha)x + hx^2 + hx^3\, \eta_3(h, x, \alpha) \tag{19}$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, x, \alpha) := (1 + h\alpha)x + hx^2 + hx^3\, \widetilde{\eta}_3(h, x, \alpha), \tag{20}$$

where η_3 and $\widetilde{\eta}_3$ are smooth functions. Let $K > 0$ denote a uniform bound on $\left|\frac{\mathrm{d}^i}{\mathrm{d}x^i}\, \eta(h, \cdot, \alpha)\right|$ ($i \in \{0, 1, 2\}, \eta \in \{\eta_3, \widetilde{\eta}_3\}$) in a neighborhood of the origin for small $h > 0$ and $|\alpha|$, as well as a uniform bound on $\left|\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\, \eta(h, x, \cdot)\right|$ ($\eta \in \{\eta_3, \widetilde{\eta}_3\}$) in a neighborhood of the origin for small $h > 0$ and $|x|$. Theorem 2.5 and the reductions mentioned afterwards imply that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$|\mathcal{N}_\Phi(h, x, \alpha) - \mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, x, \alpha)| \le c \cdot h^{p+1} |x|^3 \tag{21}$$

holds for all sufficiently small $h > 0$, $|x| \ge 0$ and $|\alpha| \ge 0$. Throughout Section 3, c will denote this particular positive constant. Other generic positive constants, if needed, are denoted by *const*.

It is easy to see that for any fixed $h > 0$, $\omega_{\Phi,0}(h, \alpha) = 0$ is an attracting fixed point of the map $\mathcal{N}_\Phi(h, \cdot, \alpha)$ for $\alpha < 0$, and repelling for $\alpha > 0$, see Figure 3. For any fixed $\alpha \in [-\alpha_0, \alpha_0] \setminus \{0\}$, $\mathcal{N}_\Phi(h, \cdot, \alpha)$ possesses another fixed point, denoted by $\omega_{\Phi,+} \equiv \omega_{\Phi,+}(h, \alpha) > 0$ (for $\alpha < 0$) and



Figure 3: The branch of stable (continuous line) and unstable (dashed line) fixed points of $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E$ are shown together with the first few terms of the inner sequences $x_n(h,\alpha)$ and $y_n(h,\alpha)$, and the outer sequence $z_n(h,\alpha)$, for some fixed $h>0$ and α. The arrows indicate the direction of these sequences.

$\omega_{\Phi,-} \equiv \omega_{\Phi,-}(h,\alpha) < 0$ (for $\alpha > 0$). It is seen that $\omega_{\Phi,+}$ is repelling and $\omega_{\Phi,-}$ is attracting. The two branches of fixed points, $\omega_{\Phi,0}(h,\alpha)$ and $\omega_{\Phi,\pm}(h,\alpha)$ merge at $\alpha = 0$. Analogous results hold for the map $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(h,\cdot,\alpha)$. Its fixed points are denoted by $\omega_{\varphi,0} \equiv 0$, $\omega_{\varphi,-}$ and $\omega_{\varphi,+}$.

In the rest of this section the conjugacy map is constructed in a natural way in the $x \le 0$ region. The $x > 0$ case is similar due to symmetry, hence it is omitted here. In what follows, we suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < h \le h_0 &:= \frac{1}{5}, \\ |x| \le \varepsilon_0 &:= \min\left(\frac{1}{25}, \frac{1}{25K}\right) \quad \text{and} \\ |\alpha| \le \alpha_0 &:= \min\left(\frac{1}{51}, \frac{1}{51K}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

With these values of h_0, ε_0 and α_0, all constructions and proofs below can be carried out. (There is only one constraint which has not been taken into account explicitly: if the domain of definition of the functions η_3 and $\widetilde{\eta}_3$ is smaller than $(0,h_0]\times[-\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_0]\times[-\alpha_0,\alpha_0]$ given above, then h_0, ε_0 or α_0 should be decreased further suitably.)

By iterating one of the normal forms, say $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(h,\cdot,\alpha)$, let us define three sequences x_n, y_n and z_n. For $\alpha > 0$, let $x_n \equiv x_n(h,\alpha)$ be defined as

$$x_{n+1} := \mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, x_n, \alpha), \quad n = 0,1,2,\dots$$

with $x_0 := -\frac{\alpha}{3}$, and let $y_n \equiv y_n(h,\alpha)$ be defined as

$$y_n := \left(\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E\right)^{[-n]}(x_0), \quad n = 0,1,2,\dots,$$

so $y_0 := x_0$, and set $y_{-1} := x_1$. Finally, for all $\alpha \in [-\alpha_0, \alpha_0]$ define $z_n \equiv z_n(h,\alpha)$ as

$$z_n := \left(\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E\right)^{[n]}(z_0), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

with $z_0 < 0$ being independent of h and α such that $2\alpha_0 < |z_0| < \frac{1}{2K}$ holds. An appropriate choice for z_0 is, e.g., $z_0 := -\varepsilon_0$.

Simple calculations show that under conditions (22), for example, both $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E$ and $\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E$ (together with their inverses) are strictly monotone increasing, moreover, $|\alpha| < \frac{6}{K}$ implies $x_0(\alpha) > x_1(h,\alpha)$, and $2\alpha_0 < |z_0| < \frac{1}{2K}$ implies $z_0 < z_1(h,\alpha)$. This means that x_n is strictly decreasing, y_n is strictly increasing (for $\alpha > 0$ and $n \geq 0$), and $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n(h,\alpha) = \omega_{\varphi,-}$, while $\lim_{n\to\infty} y_n(h,\alpha) = \omega_{\varphi,0}$. Similarly, z_n is strictly increasing, moreover, $\lim_{n\to\infty} z_n(h,\alpha) = \omega_{\varphi,-}$ for $\alpha > 0$, and $\lim_{n\to\infty} z_n(h,\alpha) = \omega_{\varphi,0}$ for $\alpha \leq 0$.

A homeomorphism J^E satisfying the conjugacy equation

$$J^E \circ \mathcal{N}_\varphi^E = \mathcal{N}_\Phi^E \circ J^E \tag{23}$$

is now piecewise defined on the fundamental domains, i.e., on $[x_{n+1}, x_n]$, $[y_n, y_{n+1}]$ and $[z_n, z_{n+1}]$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$), for any fixed $0 < h \leq h_0$ and $-\alpha_0 \leq \alpha \leq \alpha_0$.

We first consider the inner region, that is, the region between the fixed points for $0 < \alpha \leq \alpha_0$. Set $J^E(x_0) := x_0$, $J^E(x_1) := \mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(x_0)$ and for $x \in [x_1, x_0]$ extend J^E linearly. For $n \geq 1$ and $x \in [x_{n+1}, x_n]$, we recursively set

$$J^E(x) := \left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E \circ J^E \circ \left(\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E\right)^{[-1]}\right)(x),$$

while for $n \geq 0$ and $x \in [y_n, y_{n+1}]$, we let

$$J^E(x) := \left(\left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E\right)^{[-1]} \circ J^E \circ \mathcal{N}_\varphi^E\right)(x).$$

(Since $[y_{-1}, y_0] \equiv [x_1, x_0]$, these two definitions are compatible.) Finally, set $J^E(\omega_{\varphi,-}) := \omega_{\Phi,-}$ and $J^E(\omega_{\varphi,0}) := \omega_{\Phi,0}$. Then J^E is continuous, strictly monotone increasing on $[\omega_{\varphi,-}, 0]$, since it is a composition of three such functions, and satisfies (23).

In the outer region, i.e., below the fixed points, fix $z_0 < 0$ ($2\alpha_0 < |z_0| < \frac{1}{2K}$). For $\alpha \in [-\alpha_0, \alpha_0]$, the definition of J^E is analogous to the above construction with x_n: this time z_n plays the role of x_n (now the counterpart of the sequence y_n is not needed). Then the function J^E is continuous and strictly monotone increasing on $[z_0, \omega_{\varphi,-}]$ (for $0 < \alpha \leq \alpha_0$) and on $[z_0, \omega_{\varphi,0}]$ (for $-\alpha_0 \leq \alpha \leq 0$), and satisfies (23).

The construction of J^E—with the appropriate and natural modifications—in the upper half-plane $x > 0$ is analogous to the one presented above.

3.2 Conjugacy estimates: optimality at the TC fixed points

We prove here that the constructed conjugacy J^E is $\mathcal{O}\big(h^p\,\alpha^2\big)$-close to the identity at the fixed points $\omega_{\varphi,-}(h,\alpha)$, moreover, an explicit example will show that this estimate is optimal in h and α. Since fixed points must be mapped into nearby fixed points by the conjugacy, this means that the estimates in Theorem 2.6 are optimal in h.

First, two useful lemmas are presented.

Lemma 3.1 *For every $0 < h \leq h_0$ and $0 < \alpha \leq \alpha_0$ we have that*

$$\{\omega_{\varphi,-}, \omega_{\Phi,-}\} \subset \left(-\frac{3}{2}\alpha, -\frac{6}{7}\alpha\right).$$

Proof. By definition, $\omega_{\varphi,-}$ solves $\alpha+x+x^2\cdot\widetilde{\eta}_3(h,x,\alpha)=0$. But $|x|\le\frac{1}{6K}$ implies $\frac{2}{3}\le 1+x\,\widetilde{\eta}_3\le\frac{7}{6}$, so

$$-\frac{3\alpha}{2}\le\omega_{\varphi,-}=\frac{-\alpha}{1+\omega_{\varphi,-}\cdot\widetilde{\eta}_3(h,\omega_{\varphi,-},\alpha)}\le-\frac{6\alpha}{7}.$$

The proof for $\omega_{\Phi,-}$ is similar. $\square$

Lemma 3.2 *For any $0<h\le h_0$, $-\varepsilon_0\le x<0$ and $-\alpha_0\le\alpha\le\alpha_0$, we have that*

$$\left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E\right)'(x)\le 1+h\alpha+\frac{7}{4}hx.$$

Proof. The conditions in (22) have been set up to imply this inequality, too. $\square$

Lemma 3.3 *For any $0<h\le h_0$ and $0<\alpha\le\alpha_0$ satisfying (22), we have that*

$$|\,\omega_{\varphi,-}-\omega_{\Phi,-}\,|\le\frac{27}{4}c\cdot h^p\,\alpha^2.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, (21) and Lemma 3.2, we have

$$|id-J^E|(\omega_{\varphi,-}(h,\alpha))\le|\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(\omega_{\varphi,-})-\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(\omega_{\varphi,-})|+|\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(\omega_{\varphi,-})-\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(\omega_{\Phi,-})|\le$$

$$c\cdot h^{p+1}|\omega_{\varphi,-}|^3+\left(\sup_{[\{\,\omega_{\varphi,-},\omega_{\Phi,-}\,\}]}\left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E\right)'\right)|\,\omega_{\varphi,-}-\omega_{\Phi,-}\,|\le$$

$$\frac{27}{8}c\cdot h^{p+1}\alpha^3+\left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)|\,\omega_{\varphi,-}-\omega_{\Phi,-}\,|.$$

Solving the above inequality for $|\,\omega_{\varphi,-}-\omega_{\Phi,-}\,|\equiv|id-J^E|(\omega_{\varphi,-})$ yields the desired result. $\square$

Remark 3.4 *The following example shows that the distance of fixed points of normal forms satisfying (21) can be bounded from below by const $\cdot\,h^p$ ($h\to 0$). Indeed, set $\mathcal{N}_\Phi(h,x,\alpha):=(1+h\alpha)x+hx^2$ and $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(h,x,\alpha):=(1+h\alpha)x+hx^2+h^{p+1}x^3$. Then these maps satisfy (21) in a neighborhood of the origin, moreover, $\omega_{\Phi,-}=-\alpha$ and $\omega_{\varphi,-}=\frac{-1+\sqrt{1-4h^p\,\alpha}}{2h^p}$. Using inequality $1+\frac{t}{2}-\frac{t^2}{4}\le\sqrt{1+t}\le 1+\frac{t}{2}-\frac{t^2}{8}$ for $-\frac{1}{2}\le t\le 0$, one sees that*

$$|\,\omega_{\varphi,-}-\omega_{\Phi,-}\,|\ge h^p\,\alpha^2,$$

if, for example, $h\le 1$ and $\alpha\le\frac{1}{8}$. $\square$

3.3 Conjugacy estimates in the inner TC region

In this section, for any fixed $0<h\le h_0$ and $0<\alpha\le\alpha_0$, the closeness estimate is proved in $(\omega_{\varphi,-},0)$. First, the proof is presented in $(\omega_{\varphi,-},x_0]$ (Lemma 3.9), then in $(x_0,0)$ (Lemma 3.11). (As for the boundary points, the conjugacy estimates at $\omega_{\varphi,-}$ have already been covered by Lemma 3.3, while at 0 these estimates are trivial.)

It is clear that $\sup_{(\omega_{\varphi,-},x_0]}|id-J^E|=\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\sup_{[x_{n+1},x_n]}|id-J^E|$. Since $x_0=J^E(x_0)$, we have that

$$\sup_{[x_1,x_0]}|id-J^E|=|x_1-J^E(x_1)|=|\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x_0)-\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(x_0)|\le$$

$$c\cdot h^{p+1}|x_0|^3=\frac{c}{27}h^{p+1}\alpha^3,$$

while for $n \geq 1$,

$$\sup_{[x_{n+1},x_n]} |id - J^E| \leq \sup_{[x_{n+1},x_n]} \left| \mathcal{N}_\varphi^E \circ (\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E)^{[-1]} - \mathcal{N}_\Phi^E \circ (\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E)^{[-1]} \right| +$$

$$\sup_{[x_{n+1},x_n]} \left| \mathcal{N}_\Phi^E \circ (\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E)^{[-1]} - \mathcal{N}_\Phi^E \circ J^E \circ (\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E)^{[-1]} \right| =$$

$$\sup_{[x_n,x_{n-1}]} \left| \mathcal{N}_\varphi^E - \mathcal{N}_\Phi^E \right| + \sup_{[x_n,x_{n-1}]} \left| \mathcal{N}_\Phi^E - \mathcal{N}_\Phi^E \circ J^E \right| \leq$$

$$\sup_{[x_n,x_{n-1}]} \left| \mathcal{N}_\varphi^E - \mathcal{N}_\Phi^E \right| + \sup_{x \in [x_n,x_{n-1}]} \left(\left(\sup_{[\{x,J^E(x)\}]} (\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)' \right) |\, x - J^E(x)| \right) \leq$$

$$c \cdot h^{p+1} |x_n|^3 + \left(1 + h\alpha + \frac{7}{4} h \max\left(x_{n-1}, J^E(x_{n-1})\right) \right) \sup_{[x_n,x_{n-1}]} |id - J^E|.$$

Here the last inequality is true because we take into account Lemma 3.2 and use the fact that the functions id and J^E are increasing, so

$$\sup_{[\{x,J^E(x)\}]} (\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)' \leq \sup_{[\{x,J^E(x)\}]} (1 + h\alpha + \frac{7}{4} h \cdot id) \leq 1 + h\alpha + \frac{7}{4} h \max\left(x, J^E(x)\right).$$

From these we have for $n \geq 1$ that

$$\sup_{[x_{n+1},x_n]} |id - J^E| \leq c \cdot h^{p+1} \sum_{i=0}^{n} |x_i|^3 \prod_{j=i}^{n-1} \left(1 + h\alpha + \frac{7}{4} h \max\left(x_j, J^E(x_j)\right) \right),$$

where $\prod_{j=n}^{n-1}$ is understood to be 1.

So in order to prove that the conjugacy J^E is $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$-close to the identity on the interval $(\omega_{\varphi,-}, x_0]$ for any $h \in (0, h_0]$ and $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$, it is enough to show that

$$\sup_{h \in (0,h_0]} \sup_{\alpha \in (0,\alpha_0]} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} h \sum_{i=0}^{n} |x_i|^3 \prod_{j=i}^{n-1} \left(1 + h\alpha + \frac{7}{4} h \max\left(x_j, J^E(x_j)\right) \right) \leq const \tag{24}$$

holds with a suitable $const \geq 0$.

First an explicit estimate of the sequence $\max\left(x_n, J^E(x_n)\right)$ is given.

Lemma 3.5 *For $n \geq 0$, set*

$$a_n(h, \alpha) := -\frac{3}{4}\alpha \cdot \frac{(1 + h\alpha)^{n+1}}{2 + (1 + h\alpha)^n}.$$

Then $x_n \in (\omega_{\varphi,-}, a_n)$ and $J^E(x_n) \in (\omega_{\Phi,-}, a_n)$.

Proof. It is easily checked that, due to assumptions (22),

$$\max\left(\omega_{\varphi,-}, \omega_{\Phi,-}\right) < a_n$$

for $n \geq 0$, so the intervals in the lemma are non-degenerate. We proceed by induction: $a_0 = -\frac{\alpha}{4}(1+h\alpha) > x_0 \equiv J^E(x_0) \equiv -\frac{\alpha}{3}$ is equivalent to $h\alpha < \frac{1}{3}$, being true by assumptions (22) on h_0 and α_0. So suppose that the statement is true for some $n \geq 0$. Since $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x) < (1+h\alpha)x + \frac{6}{5}hx^2$ is implied by $|x| \leq \varepsilon_0 < \frac{1}{5K}$, and $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E$ is monotone increasing, we get that

$$x_{n+1} = \mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x_n) < \mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(a_n) < (1 + h\alpha)a_n + \frac{6}{5} h a_n^2.$$

Therefore it is enough to prove that the right-hand side above is smaller than a_{n+1}. But

$$a_{n+1} - \left((1+h\alpha)a_n + \frac{6}{5}ha_n^2\right) =$$

$$-\frac{3h\alpha^2(1+h\alpha)^{2+2n}\left(-2+(1+h\alpha)^n(-1+9h\alpha)\right)}{40\left(2+(1+h\alpha)^n\right)^2\left(2+(1+h\alpha)^{n+1}\right)} > 0$$

is equivalent to $-2+(1+h\alpha)^n(-1+9h\alpha) < 0$, which is implied by $h\alpha < \frac{1}{9}$.

Of course, the above inequalities remain true, if $\mathcal{N}_\varphi$ is replaced by $\mathcal{N}_\Phi$, also noticing that, by construction, $J^E(x_{n+1}) = \mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(J^E(x_n))$, so the proof is complete. $\square$

Remark 3.6 *The induction would fail, if, in estimate $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x) < (1+h\alpha)x + \frac{6}{5}hx^2$, the constant $\frac{6}{5}$ was replaced by, say, $\frac{7}{5}$. (The explanation resides in the particular choice of the constant $\frac{3}{4}$ in the definition of a_n, since $\frac{3}{4}\cdot\frac{6}{5} < 1 < \frac{3}{4}\cdot\frac{7}{5}$.)* $\square$

Remark 3.7 *The upper estimate a_n has been found by experiments with Mathematica based on the parameterized model functions (13).* $\square$

In order to prove the boundedness of the left-hand side of (24), the sum $\sum_{i=0}^n$ will be split into two. An appropriate index to split at is $\lceil \frac{const}{h\alpha} \rceil$, as established by the following lemma.

Lemma 3.8 *Suppose that $n > \lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil$. Then*

$$\max\left(x_n, J^E(x_n)\right) < -\frac{2}{3}\alpha,$$

hence

$$1 + h\alpha + \frac{7}{4}h\max\left(x_n, J^E(x_n)\right) < 1 - \frac{h\alpha}{6}$$

holds for $n > \lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.5 it is sufficient to show that $n > \lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil$ implies $a_n < -\frac{2}{3}\alpha$. This latter inequality is equivalent to $(1+h\alpha)^n(1+9h\alpha) > 16$. But for $n > \lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil$,

$$(1+h\alpha)^n > (1+h\alpha)^{\lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil} = \left(1 + \frac{1}{\frac{1}{h\alpha}}\right)^{\left(1+\frac{1}{h\alpha}\right)\cdot\frac{h\alpha}{1+h\alpha}\cdot\lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil}.$$

However, it is known that $\left(1+\frac{1}{A}\right)^{A+1} > e$ for $A \geq 1$, and it is easy to see that $\frac{B}{1+B}\cdot\lceil \frac{6}{B} \rceil > 3$ for $0 < B < 1$. Since $e^3 > 16$, the proof is complete. $\square$

Now we can turn to (24). Fix $h \in (0, h_0]$, $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. (For $n \leq \lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil$, the sums $\sum_{i=\lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil+1}^n$ below are, of course, not present, making the proof even simpler.) Since now $\omega_{\varphi,-} < x_i < 0$, by Lemma 3.1 we have $|x_i| \leq \frac{3}{2}\alpha$, and by monotonicity $\max\left(x_j, J^E(x_j)\right) \leq x_0 \equiv J^E(x_0) \equiv -\frac{\alpha}{3}$. Moreover, by using Lemma 3.8, assumption $h\alpha < 1$ from (22), and inequality $(1+\frac{1}{A})^A \leq e$ (for $A \geq 1$), we get that

$$h\sum_{i=0}^n |x_i|^3 \prod_{j=i}^{n-1}\left(1 + h\alpha + \frac{7}{4}h\max\left(x_j, J^E(x_j)\right)\right) \leq$$

$$\frac{27h\alpha^3}{8}\sum_{i=0}^{\lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil}\prod_{j=1}^{\lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil - 1}\left(1 + h\alpha - \frac{7}{4}\cdot\frac{h\alpha}{3}\right) + \frac{27h\alpha^3}{8}\sum_{i=\lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil+1}^{n}\prod_{j=i}^{n-1}\left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{6}\right) \leq$$

$$\frac{27h\alpha^3}{8}\left(1+\frac{5}{12}h\alpha\right)^{\frac{6}{h\alpha}}\left(\left\lceil\frac{6}{h\alpha}\right\rceil+1\right)+\frac{27h\alpha^3}{8}\sum_{i=\lceil\frac{6}{h\alpha}\rceil+1}^{n}\left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{6}\right)^{n-i}\leq$$

$$\frac{27h\alpha^3}{8}\left(1+\frac{5}{12}h\alpha\right)^{\frac{12}{5h\alpha}\cdot\frac{5h\alpha}{12}\cdot\frac{6}{h\alpha}}\left(\frac{6+2h\alpha}{h\alpha}\right)+\frac{27h\alpha^3}{8}\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{6}\right)^{i}\leq$$

$$\frac{27h\alpha^3}{8}\cdot e^{\frac{30}{12}}\cdot\frac{8}{h\alpha}+\frac{27h\alpha^3}{8}\cdot\frac{6}{h\alpha}\leq 350\,\alpha^2.$$

Therefore, $\sup_{[x_{n+1},x_n]}|id-J^E|\leq 350c\cdot h^p\alpha^2$ for any $h\in(0,h_0]$, $\alpha\in(0,\alpha_0]$ and $n\geq 1$, moreover, as we have seen, $\sup_{[x_1,x_0]}|id-J^E|\leq\frac{c}{27}h^{p+1}\alpha^3$, which yield the following lemma.

Lemma 3.9 *Under assumption (22),*

$$\sup_{(\omega_{\varphi,_},x_0]}|id-J^E|\leq 350c\cdot h^p\alpha^2.$$

In the rest of this section, the closeness estimate is proved in the interval $(y_0,\omega_{\varphi,0})$. Recall that $y_0=x_0=J^E(x_0)\equiv-\frac{\alpha}{3}$ and $\omega_{\varphi,0}=\omega_{\Phi,0}\equiv 0$.

Suppose that $n\geq 1$ (the case $n=0$ will be examined later). Then

$$\sup_{[y_n,y_{n+1}]}|id-J^E|=\sup_{[y_n,y_{n+1}]}\left|\left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E\right)^{[-1]}\circ\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E-\left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E\right)^{[-1]}\circ J^E\circ\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E\right|\leq$$

$$\sup_{x\in[y_n,y_{n+1}]}\left[\left(\sup_{[\{\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(x),J^E\circ\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x)\}]}\left((\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)^{[-1]}\right)'\right)\left(\left|\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E-\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E\right|(x)+\left|\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E-J^E\circ\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E\right|(x)\right)\right]\leq$$

$$\left[\sup_{x\in[y_n,y_{n+1}]}\sup_{[\{\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(x),J^E\circ\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x)\}]}\left((\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)^{[-1]}\right)'\right]\left[c\cdot h^{p+1}|y_n|^3+\sup_{[y_{n-1},y_n]}|id-J^E|\right],$$

provided that $\sup_{[\{\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(x),J^E\circ\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x)\}]}\left((\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)^{[-1]}\right)'$ is non-negative.

Lemma 3.10 *Suppose that $n\geq 1$, then under assumption (22) we have that*

$$\sup_{x\in[y_n,y_{n+1}]}\sup_{[\{\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(x),J^E\circ\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x)\}]}\left((\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)^{[-1]}\right)'\leq 1-\frac{h\alpha}{8}.$$

Proof.

$$\sup_{x\in[y_n,y_{n+1}]}\sup_{[\{\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(x),J^E\circ\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x)\}]}\left((\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)^{[-1]}\right)'=\sup_{x\in[y_n,y_{n+1}]}\sup_{[\{\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(x),J^E\circ\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x)\}]}\frac{1}{(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)'\circ(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)^{[-1]}}=$$

$$\sup_{x\in[y_n,y_{n+1}]}\sup_{[\{x,(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)^{[-1]}\circ J^E\circ\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x)\}]}\frac{1}{(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)'}=\dots$$

But by definition $(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)^{[-1]}\circ J^E\circ\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x)=J^E(x)$ for $x\in[y_n,y_{n+1}]$, and $[\{x,J^E(x)\}]=[\min(x,J^E(x)),\max(x,J^E(x))]$, moreover, by the monotonicity of id and J^E we obtain that

$$\dots=\sup_{[\min(y_n,J^E(y_n)),\max(y_{n+1},J^E(y_{n+1}))]}\frac{1}{(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)'}\leq\dots$$

By construction, however, $[\min(y_n, J^E(y_n)), \max(y_{n+1}, J^E(y_{n+1}))] \subset (y_0, 0) = \left(-\frac{\alpha}{3}, 0\right)$ and $\left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E\right)'$ is nonnegative here by assumption (22), justifying the computations just above the lemma. We now continue the proof of the lemma as

$$\ldots \leq \sup_{\left(-\frac{\alpha}{3}, 0\right)} \frac{1}{(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)'} \leq \ldots$$

It is easy to see that (22) together with $x < 0$ imply $(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)'(x) \geq 1 + h\alpha + \frac{9}{4}hx \geq 0$. So

$$\ldots \leq \sup_{x \in \left(-\frac{\alpha}{3}, 0\right)} \frac{1}{1 + h\alpha + \frac{9}{4}hx} \leq \frac{1}{1 + h\alpha + \frac{9}{4}h\left(-\frac{\alpha}{3}\right)} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{4}h\alpha} \leq 1 - \frac{h\alpha}{8},$$

since $\frac{1}{1+A} \leq 1 - \frac{A}{2}$ for $A \in [0, 1]$. $\square$

We have thus proved (also using $|y_n| \leq \frac{\alpha}{3}$) that for $n \geq 1$

$$\sup_{[y_n, y_{n+1}]} |id - J^E| \leq \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{8}\right) \left[\frac{c}{27} \cdot h^{p+1}\alpha^3 + \sup_{[y_{n-1}, y_n]} |id - J^E|\right]. \tag{25}$$

For $n = 0$, similarly as before, we get that

$$\sup_{[y_0, y_1]} |id - J^E| \leq \left[\sup_{x \in [y_0, y_1]} \sup_{[\{\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(x), J^E \circ \mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x)\}]} \left((\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)^{[-1]}\right)'\right] \left[c \cdot h^{p+1}|y_0|^3 + \sup_{[y_{-1}, y_0]} |id - J^E|\right].$$

But $[y_{-1}, y_0] \equiv [x_1, x_0]$, so the second factor $[\ldots]$ is bounded by $2 \cdot \frac{c}{27}h^{p+1}\alpha^3$. As for the first factor $[\ldots]$, we notice that $y_0 < (\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)^{[-1]}(y_0)$ (since this is equivalent to $x_1 < x_0$), which implies that

$$\sup_{x \in [y_0, y_1]} \sup_{[\{\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(x), J^E \circ \mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x)\}]} \left((\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)^{[-1]}\right)' = \sup_{x \in [y_0, y_1]} \sup_{[\{x, (\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)^{[-1]} \circ J^E \circ \mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x)\}]} \frac{1}{(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)'} =$$

$$\sup_{[y_0, y_1] \cup [y_0, (\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)^{[-1]}(y_0)]} \frac{1}{(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)'} \leq \sup_{[y_0, 0)} \frac{1}{(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E)'} \leq 1.$$

Therefore

$$\sup_{[y_0, y_1]} |id - J^E| \leq 2 \cdot \frac{c}{27}h^{p+1}\alpha^3. \tag{26}$$

Repeated application of (25), moreover (26) yield for $n \geq 1$ that

$$\sup_{[y_n, y_{n+1}]} |id - J^E| \leq \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{8}\right)^n \sup_{[y_0, y_1]} |id - J^E| + \frac{c}{27}h^{p+1}\alpha^3 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{8}\right)^i \leq$$

$$1 \cdot 2 \cdot \frac{c}{27}h^{p+1}\alpha^3 + \frac{c}{27}h^{p+1}\alpha^3 \cdot \frac{8}{h\alpha} \leq \frac{c}{3}h^p\alpha^2,$$

due to $h\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$ by (22). The same upper estimate is valid for $n = 0$, so we have proved the following result.

Lemma 3.11 *Under assumption (22)*

$$\sup_{(x_0, 0)} |id - J^E| \leq \frac{c}{3}h^p\alpha^2.$$

3.4 Conjugacy estimates in the outer TC region

In this section, we first prove an $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$-closeness estimate in the interval $[z_0, \omega_{\varphi,-})$ for $\alpha > 0$, then, in the second part, the closeness is proved on $[z_0, \omega_{\Phi,0}) \equiv [z_0, 0)$ for $\alpha \le 0$.

The derivation of the following formulae is similar to their counterparts in the inner region, with the difference that now an extra term and an index-shift occur (since this time the sequence z_n is increasing). For $n \ge 1$ (by also using (22)) we have that

$$\sup_{[z_n, z_{n+1}]} |id - J^E| \le c \cdot h^{p+1} |z_0|^3 \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(1 + h\alpha + \frac{7}{4} h \max\left(z_j, J^E(z_j)\right)\right) +$$

$$c \cdot h^{p+1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |z_i|^3 \prod_{j=i+2}^{n} \left(1 + h\alpha + \frac{7}{4} h \max\left(z_j, J^E(z_j)\right)\right), \tag{27}$$

where, again, $\prod_{j=n+1}^{n}$ is 1, while the $n = 0$ case is simply

$$\sup_{[z_0, z_1]} |id - J^E| \le c \cdot h^{p+1} |z_0|^3.$$

The following main lemma, as a counterpart of Lemma 3.5, gives a lower estimate of the sequence z_n for $\alpha > 0$.

Lemma 3.12 *For $n \ge 0$, set*

$$b_n(h, \alpha) := -2\alpha \cdot \frac{(1 + h\alpha)^{n+1}}{-1 + \alpha + (1 + h\alpha)^n},$$

then $b_n \le \min\left(z_n, J^E(z_n)\right)$.

Proof. We see that $b_0 = -2 - 2h\alpha < -2 \le -1 \le -\varepsilon_0 \le z_0 = J^E(z_0)$ holds due to assumption (22). So suppose that the statement is true for some $n \ge 0$. Since $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x) \ge (1 + h\alpha)x + \frac{3}{5}hx^2$ follows from $|x| \le \varepsilon_0 < \frac{2}{5K}$, moreover, $(1 + h\alpha)id + \frac{3}{5}h\, id^2$ is monotone increasing (which is implied by, e.g., $|x| \le \frac{5}{6h}$; but it is easy to see that $h \le \frac{5}{18}$ and $-3 < b_n < 0$ follows from (22), hence $|b_n| \le \frac{5}{6h}$), so we obtain that

$$z_{n+1} = \mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(z_n) \ge (1 + h\alpha) z_n + \frac{3}{5} h z_n^2 \ge (1 + h\alpha) b_n + \frac{3}{5} h b_n^2.$$

Therefore it is sufficient to show that $(1 + h\alpha)b_n + \frac{3}{5}hb_n^2 \ge b_{n+1}$. However, the last inequality is equivalent to

$$0 \le \frac{2h\alpha^2 (1 + h\alpha)^{2+2n}}{5\left(-1 + \alpha + (1 + h\alpha)^n\right)^2} \cdot \frac{-1 + \alpha + (1 + h\alpha)^n (1 + 6h\alpha)}{-1 + \alpha + (1 + h\alpha)^{n+1}},$$

which is true since $\alpha > 0$ and $h > 0$.

The proof remains valid if $\mathcal{N}_\varphi$ is replaced by $\mathcal{N}_\Phi$ (and $J^E(z_n)$ is written instead of z_n), hence $b_n \le J^E(z_n)$ also holds. □

Now, since $z_j < \omega_{\varphi,-}$ and $J^E(z_j) < \omega_{\Phi,-}$, we get by Lemma 3.1 that the right-hand side of (27) is at most

$$c \cdot h^{p+1} |z_0|^3 \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}\right) + c \cdot h^{p+1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |z_i|^3 \prod_{j=i+2}^{n} \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}\right) \le$$

$$c \cdot h^{p+1}|z_0|^3 + c \cdot h^{p+1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |z_i|^3 \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-1-i}.$$

We will verify that $h \sum_{i=0}^{n} |z_i|^3 \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i}$ is uniformly bounded for any $n \geq 0$, $0 < h \leq h_0$ and $0 < \alpha \leq \alpha_0$.

For $n \geq \lceil \frac{1}{h\alpha} \rceil$, Lemma 3.12 says (also using $h\alpha \leq \frac{1}{9}$ and $z_j < 0$) that

$$h \sum_{i=\lceil \frac{1}{h\alpha} \rceil}^{n} |z_i|^3 \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i} \leq h \sum_{i=\lceil \frac{1}{h\alpha} \rceil}^{n} |b_i|^3 \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i} \leq$$

$$11h\alpha^3 \sum_{i=\lceil \frac{1}{h\alpha} \rceil}^{n} \left(\frac{(1+h\alpha)^i}{-1+\alpha+(1+h\alpha)^i}\right)^3 \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i} \leq \dots$$

For these i indices however $\frac{(1+h\alpha)^i}{-1+\alpha+(1+h\alpha)^i} \leq 3$ holds (since this is implied by $\frac{3}{2} \leq (1+h\alpha)^i$, being true by $(1+h\alpha)^i \geq (1+h\alpha)^{\frac{1}{h\alpha}} \geq 1 + \frac{1}{h\alpha} \cdot h\alpha > \frac{3}{2}$), thus

$$\dots \leq 27 \cdot 11\alpha^2 h\alpha \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^i = 594\alpha^2.$$

On the other hand, by using that $|z_i| \leq 1$ and $h\alpha \leq \frac{1}{9}$ again, for $n < \lceil \frac{1}{h\alpha} \rceil$ we have

$$h \sum_{i=0}^{n} |z_i|^3 \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i} \leq h \sum_{i=0}^{n} |z_i|^2 \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i} \leq \tag{28}$$

$$5h \sum_{i=0}^{n} \left(\frac{\alpha(1+h\alpha)^i}{-1+\alpha+(1+h\alpha)^i}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i} \leq \dots$$

Now by the inequalities $e^{\frac{x}{2}} \leq 1 + x$ (for $x \in [0,1]$) and $1 + x \leq e^x$ (for $x \in \mathbb{R}$) we get that $(1+h\alpha)^{2i} \leq e^{h\alpha 2i} \leq e^{h\alpha 2n} \leq e^2 < 8$, moreover $\left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i} \leq e^{-\frac{h\alpha}{2}(n-i)}$ and $e^{\frac{h\alpha}{2}i} \leq (1+h\alpha)^i$, therefore

$$\dots \leq 40h \sum_{i=0}^{n} \left(\frac{\alpha e^{-\frac{h\alpha}{4}(n-i)}}{-1+\alpha+e^{\frac{h\alpha}{2}i}}\right)^2. \tag{29}$$

Set $g_{h,\alpha,n}(x) \equiv g(x) := \left(\frac{\alpha \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}h\alpha(n-x)\right)}{-1+\alpha+\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}h\alpha x\right)}\right)^2$ for $x \in [0, \infty)$. Notice that g is bounded at $x = 0$. For this function we have that

$$g'(x) = -\frac{1}{2}h\alpha^3 e^{-\frac{1}{2}h\alpha(n-x)} \cdot \frac{1-\alpha+e^{\frac{1}{2}hx\alpha}}{\left(-1+\alpha+e^{\frac{1}{2}hx\alpha}\right)^3},$$

meaning that g is strictly monotone decreasing for $\alpha < 1$. Hence

$$40h \sum_{i=0}^{n} \left(\frac{\alpha e^{-\frac{h\alpha}{4}(n-i)}}{-1+\alpha+e^{\frac{h\alpha}{2}i}}\right)^2 = 40h + 40h \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_{h,\alpha,n}(i) \leq$$

$$40h + 40h \int_0^n g_{h,\alpha,n}(x)\mathrm{d}x = 40h + 40h \left[-2\alpha \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}h\alpha n\right)}{h\left(-1+\alpha+\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}h\alpha x\right)\right)}\right]_{x=0}^{n} =$$

$$40h + 40h\left(\frac{2\left(1-\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}h\alpha n\right)\right)}{h\left(\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}h\alpha n\right)-1+\alpha\right)}\right) \leq 40h + 80\left(\frac{1-\exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}h\alpha n\right)}{\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}h\alpha n\right)-1}\right) =$$

$$40h + 80e^{-\frac{1}{2}h\alpha n} \leq 120,$$

since $h \leq 1$.

Now combining all the estimates so far in the section, under assumption (22) we get for $\alpha > 0$ that

$$\sup_{[z_0,\omega_{\varphi,_})} |id - J^E| = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sup_{[z_n,z_{n+1}]} |id - J^E| \leq$$

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \max\left(c\cdot h^{p+1}|z_0|^3,\, c\cdot h^{p+1}|z_0|^3 + c\cdot h^{p+1}\sum_{i=0}^{n}|z_i|^3\left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i}\right) \leq$$

$$c\cdot h^{p+1}|z_0|^3 + c\cdot h^p\cdot(120+594\alpha^2) \leq 130c\cdot h^p.$$

Remark 3.13 *If, in (28), the exponent of $|z_i|$ had not been changed to 2, then the integral of g would have been significantly more complicated. Interestingly, similar complication occurs, if one considers simply $|z_i|$ instead of $|z_i|^2$. The rational pair $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ in the definition of g has also been a fortunate choice: when working with the numbers $\frac{1}{5}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ instead, for example, Mathematica produced so complicated integrals that were practically useless from the viewpoint of further analysis.* □

Remark 3.14 *An alternative approach to analyzing sum (29) is to estimate $e^{-\frac{h\alpha}{4}(n-i)}$ above by 1. However, the resulting integral would not be much simpler in that case either; we would then finally use the boundedness of $\alpha\ln\alpha$ for $\alpha\in(0,\alpha_0]$. Compare the above calculations with their counterparts in the PF case.* □

Finally, we prove a closeness estimate on $[z_0, 0)$ for $\alpha \leq 0$. We begin with a simple observation on monotonicity of the sequence $z_n \equiv z_n(\alpha)$ (as before, for brevity, the dependence on h is still suppressed).

Lemma 3.15 *Suppose that $\alpha \leq 0$ and assumption (22) hold. Then for any $0 < h \leq h_0$, $-\alpha_0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that*

$$0 > z_n(\alpha) \geq z_n(\beta).$$

Proof. By definition, we have that $z_0(\alpha) = z_0(\beta) = z_0$, so suppose that for some n we already know that $z_n(\alpha) \geq z_n(\beta)$. Then, by the definition of the sequence z_n, and by the facts that the function $z \mapsto \mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, z, \alpha)$ is monotone increasing and the function $\alpha \mapsto \mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, z, \alpha)$ is monotone decreasing, we get that

$$z_{n+1}(\alpha) = \mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, z_n(\alpha), \alpha) \geq \mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, z_n(\beta), \alpha) \geq \mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, z_n(\beta), \beta) = z_{n+1}(\beta),$$

which completes the induction. □

This means that $0 > z_n(\alpha) \geq z_n(0)$ holds for $\alpha \leq 0$, hence it is enough to give a lower estimate for $z_n(0)$. Such an estimate is presented in [10, Lemma 2.4.3] with an easy proof via induction. We just cite the appropriate result without proof. (In fact, [10, Lemma 2.4.3] is more general, and that estimate has been formulated in the context of the fold bifurcation. A similar version with proof is found in [11, Lemma 3.9]. See also Lemma 4.14 in the present work.)

Lemma 3.16 *Under assumption (22) and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that*

$$z_n(0) \geq z_0,$$

and for $n \geq \lfloor \frac{1}{h} \rfloor + 1$

$$z_n(0) \geq -\frac{2}{nh}.$$

Then we can simply estimate (27) for $\alpha \leq 0$ as follows. Supposing that $n \geq 1$ we get that

$$\sup_{[z_n, z_{n+1}]} |id - J^E| \leq c \cdot h^{p+1} |z_0|^3 \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(1 + h\alpha + \frac{7}{4} h \max\left(z_j, J^E(z_j)\right)\right) +$$

$$c \cdot h^{p+1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |z_i|^3 \prod_{j=i+2}^{n} \left(1 + h\alpha + \frac{7}{4} h \max\left(z_j, J^E(z_j)\right)\right) \leq$$

$$c \cdot h^{p+1} |z_0|^3 \cdot 1 + c \cdot h^p \cdot h \sum_{i=0}^{n} |z_i(0)|^3 \cdot 1 \leq$$

$$c \cdot h^p \left(h|z_0|^3 + h \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{1}{h} \rfloor} |z_i(0)|^2 + h \sum_{i=\lfloor \frac{1}{h} \rfloor + 1}^{n} |z_i(0)|^2 \right),$$

where, of course, for $n \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{h} \rfloor$ the $\sum_{i=\lfloor \frac{1}{h} \rfloor + 1}^{n}$ piece should be omitted. But

$$h \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{1}{h} \rfloor} |z_i(0)|^2 \leq (h+1) \cdot z_0^2 = 2z_0^2,$$

and

$$h \sum_{i=\lfloor \frac{1}{h} \rfloor + 1}^{n} |z_i(0)|^2 \leq h \sum_{i=\lfloor \frac{1}{h} \rfloor + 1}^{n} \frac{4}{i^2 h^2} \leq \frac{4}{h} \int_{\frac{1}{h} - 1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^2} = \frac{4}{1-h} \leq 8.$$

We have thus proved that

$$\sup_{[z_0, 0)} |id - J^E| \leq 12c \cdot h^p.$$

4 Conjugacy in the Discretized PF Bifurcation

4.1 Construction of the conjugacy in the PF case

According to Section 2.2, the normal forms in the PF case can be chosen as

$$\mathcal{N}_\Phi(h, x, \alpha) := (1 + h\alpha)x - hx^3 + hx^4\, \eta_4(h, x, \alpha) \tag{30}$$

and

$$\mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, x, \alpha) := (1 + h\alpha)x - hx^3 + hx^4\, \widetilde{\eta}_4(h, x, \alpha), \tag{31}$$

where η_4 and $\widetilde{\eta}_4$ are smooth functions. Let $K > 0$ denote a uniform bound on $\left|\frac{\mathrm{d}^i}{\mathrm{d}x^i}\, \eta(h, \cdot, \alpha)\right|$ $(i \in \{0, 1, 2\}, \eta \in \{\eta_4, \widetilde{\eta}_4\})$ in a neighborhood of the origin for any small $h > 0$ and $|\alpha|$, as well as a uniform bound on $\left|\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\, \eta(h, x, \cdot)\right|$ $(\eta \in \{\eta_4, \widetilde{\eta}_4\})$ in a $]$ of the origin for any small $h > 0$ and $|x|$. We also have that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$|\mathcal{N}_\Phi(h, x, \alpha) - \mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, x, \alpha)| \leq c \cdot h^{p+1} x^4 \tag{32}$$

holds for all sufficiently small $h > 0$, $|x| \geq 0$ and $|\alpha| \geq 0$. Throughout Section 4.1, c will denote this particular positive constant. In what follows, suppose that

$$0 < h \leq h_0 := \min\left(\frac{1}{10}, 8K^2\right),$$
$$|x| \leq \varepsilon_0 := \min\left(\frac{1}{10}, \frac{1}{5K}\right) \text{ and} \tag{33}$$
$$|\alpha| \leq \alpha_0 := \min\left(\frac{1}{288}, \frac{1}{72K^2}\right).$$

However, if the domain of definition of the functions η_4 and $\widetilde{\eta}_4$ is smaller than $(0, h_0] \times [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \times [-\alpha_0, \alpha_0]$ given above, then h_0, ε_0 or α_0 should be decreased further.

We have that for any fixed $h > 0$, $\omega_{\Phi,0}(h, \alpha) = 0$ is an attracting fixed point of the map $\mathcal{N}_\Phi(h, \cdot, \alpha)$ for $\alpha \leq 0$, and repelling for $\alpha > 0$, see Figure 4. For any fixed $h > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$, this map possesses another two attracting fixed points, denoted by $\omega_{\Phi,+} \equiv \omega_{\Phi,+}(h, \alpha) > 0$ and $\omega_{\Phi,-} \equiv \omega_{\Phi,-}(h, \alpha) < 0$. The three branches of fixed points, $\omega_{\Phi,0}(h, \alpha)$ and $\omega_{\Phi,\pm}(h, \alpha)$ merge at $\alpha = 0$. Analogous results hold for the map $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, \cdot, \alpha)$. Its fixed points are denoted by $\omega_{\varphi,0} \equiv 0$, $\omega_{\varphi,-}$ and $\omega_{\varphi,+}$.

The construction of the homeomorphism J^E is completely analogous to that in the TC case (the braches of fixed points of the PF and TC bifurcation in the lower half-plane $x \leq 0$ look topologically the same), hence it is omitted here. Here, again, we deal only with the $x \leq 0$ region—the $x > 0$ case is analogous. The only difference in the construction compared to Section 3 is that we set $x_0 := y_0 := -\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{8}}$ (for $\alpha > 0$) as a starting value in the inner region (but we keep the same $z_0 := -\varepsilon_0$ starting value in the outer region). Then conditions (33) imply that $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E$ and $\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E$ (together with their inverses) are strictly increasing, and $|\alpha| < \frac{392}{K^2}$ implies $x_0(\alpha) > x_1(h, \alpha)$, while $\sqrt{2\alpha_0} < |z_0| < \frac{1}{2K}$ implies $z_0 < z_1(h, \alpha)$. This means that x_n is strictly decreasing, y_n is strictly increasing (for $\alpha > 0$ and $n \geq 0$), and $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n(h, \alpha) = \omega_{\varphi,-}$, while $\lim_{n\to\infty} y_n(h, \alpha) = \omega_{\varphi,0}$. As for z_n, it is strictly increasing, moreover, $\lim_{n\to\infty} z_n(h, \alpha) = \omega_{\varphi,-}$ for $\alpha > 0$, and $\lim_{n\to\infty} z_n(h, \alpha) = \omega_{\varphi,0}$ for $\alpha \leq 0$.

4.2 Conjugacy estimates: optimality at the PF fixed points

We prove here that the constructed conjugacy J^E is $\mathcal{O}(h^p\,\alpha)$-close to the identity at the fixed points $\omega_{\varphi,-}(h, \alpha)$, and an explicit example shows that this estimate is optimal in h and α. This means that the $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$-closeness estimates in Theorem 2.16 are optimal in h.

The first two auxiliary lemmas will frequently be used.

Lemma 4.1 *For every $0 < h \leq h_0$ and $0 < \alpha \leq \alpha_0$ we have that*

$$\{\omega_{\varphi,-}, \omega_{\Phi,-}\} \subset \left(-\sqrt{2\alpha}, -\frac{4}{5}\sqrt{\alpha}\right) \subset \left(-\sqrt{2\alpha}, -\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}\alpha}\right).$$

Proof. By definition, $\omega_{\varphi,-} < 0$ solves $\alpha - x^2 + x^3 \cdot \widetilde{\eta}_4(h, x, \alpha) = 0$, that is

$$\omega_{\varphi,-} = -\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{1 - \omega_{\varphi,-} \cdot \widetilde{\eta}_4(h, \omega_{\varphi,-}, \alpha)}}.$$

But $|x\,\widetilde{\eta}_4| \leq \varepsilon_0 K \leq \frac{1}{2}$ implies, for example, $\frac{1}{2} \leq 1 - \omega_{\varphi,-} \cdot \widetilde{\eta}_4(h, \omega_{\varphi,-}, \alpha) \leq \frac{25}{16}$, completing the proof. In some calculations, the weaker upper bound $-\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}\alpha}$ will yield a numerically simpler result. The proof for $\omega_{\Phi,-}$ is similar. $\square$



Figure 4: The figure shows the branch of stable (continuous line) and unstable (dashed line) fixed points of $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E$ together with the first few terms of the inner sequences $x_n(h,\alpha)$ and $y_n(h,\alpha)$, and the outer sequence $z_n(h,\alpha)$, for some fixed $h>0$ and α. The arrows indicate the direction of these sequences.

Lemma 4.2 *For any $0<h\le h_0$, $-\varepsilon_0\le x<0$ and $-\alpha_0\le\alpha\le\alpha_0$, we have that*

$$\left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E\right)'(x)\le 1+h\alpha-\frac{5}{2}hx^2.$$

Proof. The conditions in (33) have been set up to imply this inequality. □

Lemma 4.3 *For any $0<h\le h_0$ and $0<\alpha\le\alpha_0$ satisfying (33), we have that*

$$|\,\omega_{\varphi,-}-\omega_{\Phi,-}\,|\le 8c\cdot h^p\,\alpha.$$

Proof. (cf. its TC counterpart) By Lemma 4.1, (32) and Lemma 4.2 we have that

$$|\,\omega_{\varphi,-}-\omega_{\Phi,-}\,|\le 4c\cdot h^{p+1}\alpha^2+\left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)|\,\omega_{\varphi,-}-\omega_{\Phi,-}\,|,$$

which yields the desired result. □

Remark 4.4 *The example below shows a situation when the distance of fixed points of normal forms satisfying (32) is bounded from below by const$\cdot h^p$ (as $h\to 0$). Since now we are going to deal with cubic polynomials, we do not attempt to construct their explicit solutions (as we did in the TC case having quadratic polynomials), but we give a more general, yet simpler argument. Set $\mathcal{N}_\Phi(h,x,\alpha):=(1+h\alpha)x-hx^3$ and $\mathcal{N}_\varphi(h,x,\alpha):=(1+h\alpha)x-hx^3+h^{p+1}x^4$. Then these maps satisfy (32) in a neighborhood of the origin, moreover, $\omega_{\Phi,-}=-\sqrt{\alpha}$. As for $\omega_{\varphi,-}$, we see that $\omega_{\varphi,-}=-\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{1-h^p\,\omega_{\varphi,-}}}$. Then by Lemma 4.1 we get that*

$$\omega_{\varphi,-}\in\left(-\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{1+h^p\,\frac{4}{5}\sqrt{\alpha}}},-\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{1+h^p\,\sqrt{2\alpha}}}\right)$$

so $\omega_{\varphi,-} > -\sqrt{\alpha} = \omega_{\Phi,-}$*, yielding*

$$|\,\omega_{\varphi,-} - \omega_{\Phi,-}\,| \geq \left| -\sqrt{\alpha} + \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{1 + h^p \,\frac{4}{5}\sqrt{\alpha}}} \right| = \sqrt{\alpha}\left| 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+t}} \right|$$

with $t := h^p \,\frac{4}{5}\sqrt{\alpha}$*. Then, by (33),* $t \in (0,1)$*. But for any such* t

$$\left| 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+t}} \right| = \frac{t}{\sqrt{1+t}(1+\sqrt{1+t})} \geq \frac{t}{4},$$

hence

$$|\,\omega_{\varphi,-} - \omega_{\Phi,-}\,| \geq \frac{1}{5} h^p\,\alpha. \quad \square$$

4.3 Conjugacy estimates in the inner PF region

In this section, for any fixed $0 < h \leq h_0$ and $0 < \alpha \leq \alpha_0$, the closeness estimate is proved in $(\omega_{\varphi,-}, 0)$ in a similar way as in the TC case, hence most intermediate steps and inequalities are omitted or only sketched (however, the key Lemma 4.5 is carefully examined). First, the proof is presented in $(\omega_{\varphi,-}, x_0]$ (Lemma 4.8), then in $(x_0, 0)$ (Lemma 4.10).

Now we have that

$$\sup_{[x_1,x_0]} |id - J^E| = \frac{c}{64} h^{p+1} \alpha^2,$$

while for $n \geq 1$

$$\sup_{[x_{n+1},x_n]} |id - J^E| \leq \sup_{[x_n,x_{n-1}]} \left| \mathcal{N}_\varphi^E - \mathcal{N}_\Phi^E \right| + \sup_{x \in [x_n,x_{n-1}]} \left(\left(\sup_{[\{x, J^E(x)\}]} \left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E\right)' \right) |x - J^E(x)| \right) \leq$$

$$c \cdot h^{p+1} x_n^4 + \left(1 + h\alpha - \frac{5}{2} h \max\left(x_{n-1}, J^E(x_{n-1})\right)^2 \right) \sup_{[x_n,x_{n-1}]} |id - J^E|,$$

where we have used Lemma 4.2, the fact that the functions id and J^E are increasing, and inequality

$$\sup_{[\{x,J^E(x)\}]} \left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E\right)' \leq \sup_{[\{x,J^E(x)\}]} \left(1 + h\alpha - \frac{5}{2} h \cdot id^2 \right) \leq 1 + h\alpha - \frac{5}{2} h \max\left(x, J^E(x)\right)^2.$$

In order to prove that the conjugacy J^E is $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$-close to the identity on $(\omega_{\varphi,-}, x_0]$ for any $h \in (0, h_0]$ and $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$, we will show that

$$\sup_{h \in (0,h_0]} \sup_{\alpha \in (0,\alpha_0]} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} h \sum_{i=0}^{n} x_i^4 \prod_{j=i}^{n-1} \left(1 + h\alpha - \frac{5}{2} h \max\left(x_j, J^E(x_j)\right)^2 \right) \leq const \tag{34}$$

holds with a suitable $const \geq 0$ (where $\prod_{j=n}^{n-1}$ is understood to be 1).

First an explicit upper estimate of the sequence $\max\left(x_n, J^E(x_n)\right)$ is given.

Lemma 4.5 *For* $n \geq 0$*, set*

$$a_n(h,\alpha) := -\frac{4}{5}\sqrt{\alpha} \cdot \frac{(1+h\alpha)^n}{\sqrt{5 + (1+h\alpha)^{2n}}},$$

then we have that $x_n \in (\omega_{\varphi,-}, a_n)$ *and* $J^E(x_n) \in (\omega_{\Phi,-}, a_n)$*.*

Proof. Due to assumptions (33), $\max\left(\omega_{\varphi,-},\omega_{\Phi,-}\right) < a_n$ for $n \geq 0$, so the intervals in the lemma are non-degenerate. We proceed by induction. We see that $a_0 > x_0 \equiv J^E(x_0) \equiv -\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{8}}$ is always satisfied. So suppose that the statement is true for some $n \geq 0$. Condition $|x| < \frac{1}{3K}$ implies $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x) < (1+h\alpha)x - \frac{4}{3}hx^3$, moreover, by monotonicity of $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E$ we get that

$$x_{n+1} = \mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x_n) < \mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(a_n) < (1+h\alpha)a_n - \frac{4}{3}ha_n^3. \tag{35}$$

Therefore it is enough to prove that

$$a_{n+1} - (1+h\alpha)a_n + \frac{4}{3}ha_n^3 > 0. \tag{36}$$

For brevity, we set $\lambda := h\alpha > 0$. Then (36) is equivalent to

$$\frac{4}{375}\left(-A+B-C\right)\sqrt{\alpha}\,(1+\lambda)^n > 0,$$

where $A := \frac{64\,\lambda\,(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}}{\left(5+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}}$, $B := \frac{75\,(1+\lambda)}{\sqrt{5+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}}}$ and $C := \frac{75\,(1+\lambda)}{\sqrt{5+(1+\lambda)^{2+2n}}}$. We will show that

$$-A+B-C > 0.$$

First put $B-C$ over a common denominator. Then, to eliminate square roots from its numerator, multiply it by $\frac{\sqrt{5+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}}+\sqrt{5+(1+\lambda)^{2+2\,n}}}{\sqrt{5+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}}+\sqrt{5+(1+\lambda)^{2+2\,n}}}$. After these manipulations, the product $\lambda(1+\lambda)^{2n} > 0$ can be factored out from all three terms. Hence $-A+B-C > 0$ becomes

$$\frac{-64}{\left(5+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{75\,(1+\lambda)\,(2+\lambda)}{\sqrt{5+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}}\,\sqrt{5+(1+\lambda)^{2+2\,n}}\left(\sqrt{5+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}}+\sqrt{5+(1+\lambda)^{2+2\,n}}\right)} > 0.$$

The left hand side of the above inequality is decreased, if the denominator of the second term is replaced by $2\sqrt{5+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}}\left(5+(1+\lambda)^{2+2\,n}\right)$. Then we can multiply the expression by $\sqrt{5+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}}$ and all square roots are got rid of: we are to verify

$$\frac{-64}{5+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}} + \frac{75\,(1+\lambda)\,(2+\lambda)}{2\left(5+(1+\lambda)^{2+2\,n}\right)} > 0.$$

By condition (33), $(1+\lambda)^2 < \frac{75}{64}$, so it is enough to show that

$$\frac{-64}{5+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}} + \frac{75\,(1+\lambda)\,(2+\lambda)}{2\left(5+\frac{75\,(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}}{64}\right)} > 0.$$

However, the left hand side above can be factored to yield

$$\frac{32\left(22+225\,\lambda+75\,\lambda^2+45\,\lambda\,(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}+15\,\lambda^2\,(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}\right)}{\left(5+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}\right)\left(64+15\,(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}\right)},$$

which is clearly positive.

The proof for the sequence $J^E(x_n)$ is the completely similar: by construction of J, the beginning of (35) should (and can) be replaced by $J^E(x_{n+1}) = \mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(J^E(x_n)) < \mathcal{N}_\Phi(a_n)$, but then every step is unchanged. $\square$

Remark 4.6 *Attempts to approximate subexpressions of the form $(a+bt)^\gamma$ with their series expansions (up to third order) turned out to be insufficient to complete the proof. To find the above "purely algebraical" manipulations, Mathematica has been extensively used. The definition of a_n is again based on the beautiful parameterized model function (13).* $\square$

The sum $\sum_{i=0}^n$ in (34) is split into two at $\lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil$. This choice is motivated by the following lemma.

Lemma 4.7 *Suppose that $n > \lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil$. Then*

$$\max\left(x_n, J^E(x_n)\right) < -\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}\alpha},$$

hence

$$1 + h\alpha - \frac{5}{2}h\max\left(x_n, J^E(x_n)\right)^2 < 1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}$$

holds for $n > \lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil$.

Proof. By virtue of Lemma 4.5 it is enough to show that $n > \lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil$ implies $a_n < -\sqrt{\frac{3}{5}\alpha}$. But this latter inequality is equivalent to $(1+h\alpha)^n > \sqrt{75}$. However, $e^3 > \sqrt{75}$, so the corresponding proof given in the TC case suffices here, too. $\square$

Let us turn directly to (34) now and fix $h \in (0, h_0]$, $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ arbitrarily. (If $n \leq \lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil$, then the sums $\sum_{i=\lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil + 1}^n$ below are absent and the proof is simpler.) Using $\omega_{\varphi,-} < x_i < 0$, $|x_i| \leq \sqrt{2\alpha}$ (by Lemma 4.1), and $\max\left(x_j, J^E(x_j)\right) \leq x_0 \equiv J^E(x_0) \equiv -\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{8}}$ (by monotonicity), moreover, Lemma 4.7, assumption $h\alpha < 1$ from (33) and inequality $(1+\frac{1}{A})^A \leq e$ (for $A \geq 1$), we see that

$$h\sum_{i=0}^{n} x_i^4 \prod_{j=i}^{n-1}\left(1 + h\alpha - \frac{5}{2}h\max\left(x_j, J^E(x_j)\right)^2\right) \leq$$

$$4h\alpha^2 \sum_{i=0}^{\lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil} \prod_{j=1}^{\lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil - 1}\left(1 + h\alpha - \frac{5}{2}\cdot\frac{h\alpha}{8}\right) + 4h\alpha^2 \sum_{i=\lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil + 1}^{n} \prod_{j=i}^{n-1}\left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}\right) \leq$$

$$4h\alpha^2\left(1 + \frac{11}{16}h\alpha\right)^{\frac{6}{h\alpha}}\left(\left\lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \right\rceil + 1\right) + 4h\alpha^2 \sum_{i=\lceil \frac{6}{h\alpha} \rceil + 1}^{n}\left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i} \leq$$

$$4h\alpha^2\left(1 + \frac{11}{16}h\alpha\right)^{\frac{16}{11h\alpha}\cdot\frac{11h\alpha}{16}\cdot\frac{6}{h\alpha}}\left(\frac{6 + 2h\alpha}{h\alpha}\right) + 4h\alpha^2\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^i \leq$$

$$4h\alpha^2 \cdot e^{\frac{66}{16}} \cdot \frac{8}{h\alpha} + 4h\alpha^2 \cdot \frac{2}{h\alpha} \leq 1988\,\alpha.$$

Therefore, $\sup_{[x_{n+1}, x_n]} |id - J^E| \leq 1988c \cdot h^p\alpha$ for any $h \in (0, h_0]$, $\alpha \in (0, \alpha_0]$ and $n \geq 1$, and, as we have seen, $\sup_{[x_1, x_0]} |id - J^E| = \frac{c}{64}h^{p+1}\alpha^2$, which yield the following lemma.

Lemma 4.8 *Under assumption (33)*

$$\sup_{(\omega_{\varphi,_},x_0]} |id - J^E| \le 1988c \cdot h^p \alpha.$$

In the rest of the section, the closeness estimate is proved in the interval $(y_0, \omega_{\varphi,0})$. Recall that $y_0 = x_0 = J^E(x_0) \equiv -\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{8}}$ and $\omega_{\varphi,0} = \omega_{\Phi,0} \equiv 0$.

Suppose first that $n \ge 1$ (the case $n = 0$ will be examined later). Then we proceed exactly as in the TC case, so we will only list the differences. We get that

$$\sup_{[y_n,y_{n+1}]} |id - J^E| \le$$

$$\left[\sup_{x\in[y_n,y_{n+1}]} \sup_{[\{\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(x), J^E\circ\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x)\}]} \left(\left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E\right)^{[-1]}\right)'\right] \left[c \cdot h^{p+1} y_n^4 + \sup_{[y_{n-1},y_n]} |id - J^E|\right].$$

The following lemma gives an upper bound on the first term above (and shows a motivation for the choice of $x_0 = -\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{8}}$).

Lemma 4.9 *Suppose that $n \ge 1$, then under assumption (33) we have that*

$$\sup_{x\in[y_n,y_{n+1}]} \sup_{[\{\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(x), J^E\circ\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x)\}]} \left(\left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E\right)^{[-1]}\right)' \le 1 - \frac{h\alpha}{4}.$$

Proof. As in the TC case, we have that

$$\sup_{x\in[y_n,y_{n+1}]} \sup_{[\{\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E(x), J^E\circ\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x)\}]} \left(\left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E\right)^{[-1]}\right)' \le \sup_{(-\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{8}},0)} \frac{1}{\left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E\right)'} \le \dots$$

But assumption (33) together with $x < 0$ imply that $\left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi^E\right)'(x) \ge 1 + h\alpha - 4hx^2 \ge 0$. So

$$\dots \le \sup_{x\in\left(-\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{8}},0\right)} \frac{1}{1 + h\alpha - 4hx^2} \le \frac{1}{1 + h\alpha - 4h\left(-\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{8}}\right)^2} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{2}h\alpha} \le 1 - \frac{h\alpha}{4}.$$

□

We have thus proved (using $|y_n| \le \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{8}}$ also) that for $n \ge 1$

$$\sup_{[y_n,y_{n+1}]} |id - J^E| \le \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{4}\right)\left[\frac{c}{64} \cdot h^{p+1}\alpha^2 + \sup_{[y_{n-1},y_n]} |id - J^E|\right].$$

For $n = 0$, similarly as in the TC case, we get that

$$\sup_{[y_0,y_1]} |id - J^E| \le 2 \cdot \frac{c}{64} h^{p+1}\alpha^2,$$

and for $n \ge 1$ that

$$\sup_{[y_n,y_{n+1}]} |id - J^E| \le \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{4}\right)^n \sup_{[y_0,y_1]} |id - J^E| + \frac{c}{64} h^{p+1}\alpha^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(1 - \frac{h\alpha}{4}\right)^i \le$$

$$1 \cdot 2 \cdot \frac{c}{64} h^{p+1}\alpha^2 + \frac{c}{64} h^{p+1}\alpha^2 \cdot \frac{4}{h\alpha} \le \frac{c}{8} h^p \alpha,$$

using $h\alpha \le 1$ by (33). Since the same upper estimate is valid for $n = 0$, too, we have proved the following lemma.

Lemma 4.10 *Under assumption (33)*

$$\sup_{(x_0,0)} |id - J^E| \le \frac{c}{8} h^p \alpha.$$

4.4 Conjugacy estimates in the outer PF region

In this section, we first prove an $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$-closeness estimate in the interval $[z_0, \omega_{\varphi,-})$ for $\alpha > 0$, then the closeness is proved on $[z_0, \omega_{\Phi,0}) \equiv [z_0, 0)$ for $\alpha \leq 0$. The key lemma of this section is Lemma 4.11.

We are already familiar with the inequalities below (cf. the TC case). For $n \geq 1$ we have that

$$\sup_{[z_n, z_{n+1}]} |id - J^E| \leq c \cdot h^{p+1} z_0^4 \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(1 + h\alpha - \frac{5}{2} h \max\left(z_j, J^E(z_j)\right)^2\right) +$$

$$c \cdot h^{p+1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} z_i^4 \prod_{j=i+2}^{n} \left(1 + h\alpha - \frac{5}{2} h \max\left(z_j, J^E(z_j)\right)^2\right), \tag{37}$$

where $\prod_{j=n+1}^{n}$ is, as always, 1, and

$$\sup_{[z_0, z_1]} |id - J^E| \leq c \cdot h^{p+1} z_0^4.$$

The lemma gives a lower estimate of the sequence z_n for $\alpha > 0$.

Lemma 4.11 *For $n \geq 0$, set*

$$b_n(h, \alpha) := -2\sqrt{\alpha} \cdot \frac{(1 + h\alpha)^n}{\sqrt{\alpha - 1 + (1 + h\alpha)^{2n}}},$$

then $b_n \leq \min\left(z_n, J^E(z_n)\right)$.

Proof. We prove by induction: $b_0 = -2 < z_0 = J^E(z_0)$ holds due to assumption (33). So suppose that the statement is true for some $n \geq 0$. We have that $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(x) \geq (1 + h\alpha)x - \frac{3}{4}hx^3$ (by $x < 0$ and $|x| \leq \varepsilon_0 < \frac{1}{4K}$), moreover, that $(1 + h\alpha)id - \frac{3}{4}h\, id^3$ is monotone increasing (which is true, for example, for $|x| \leq \frac{2}{3\sqrt{h}}$; but $|b_n| \leq 2$ is easily seen, and due to $h \leq \frac{1}{10}$ we get $|b_n| \leq \frac{2}{3\sqrt{h}}$ also), so we obtain that

$$z_{n+1} = \mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(z_n) \geq (1 + h\alpha)z_n - \frac{3}{4}hz_n^3 \geq (1 + h\alpha)b_n - \frac{3}{4}hb_n^3. \tag{38}$$

Therefore it is sufficient to show that

$$(1 + h\alpha)b_n - \frac{3}{4}hb_n^3 \geq b_{n+1},$$

being the same as

$$0 \leq 2\sqrt{\alpha}\,(1 + \lambda)^n \left(\widetilde{A} - \widetilde{B} + \widetilde{C}\right),$$

with $\widetilde{A} := \frac{3\,\lambda\,(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}}{\left(-1+\alpha+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}}$, $\widetilde{B} := \frac{1+\lambda}{\sqrt{-1+\alpha+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}}}$, $\widetilde{C} := \frac{1+\lambda}{\sqrt{-1+\alpha+(1+\lambda)^{2+2\,n}}}$ and $\lambda := h\alpha > 0$.

Now proceeding just as in Lemma 4.5, we first get

$$0 \leq \frac{3}{\left(-1 + \alpha + (1 + \lambda)^{2\,n}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}} -$$

$$\frac{\widetilde{B}\,(2 + \lambda)}{\sqrt{-1 + \alpha + (1 + \lambda)^{2+2\,n}}\left(\sqrt{-1 + \alpha + (1 + \lambda)^{2\,n}} + \sqrt{-1 + \alpha + (1 + \lambda)^{2+2\,n}}\right)}$$

to verify. Then multiply the inequality by $\sqrt{-1+\alpha+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}}$ to get

$$0 \leq \frac{3}{-1+\alpha+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}} -$$

$$\frac{(1+\lambda)\ (2+\lambda)}{\sqrt{-1+\alpha+(1+\lambda)^{2+2\,n}}\left(\sqrt{-1+\alpha+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}}+\sqrt{-1+\alpha+(1+\lambda)^{2+2\,n}}\right)}.$$

A sufficient condition for this is

$$0 \leq \frac{3}{-1+\alpha+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}} - \frac{(1+\lambda)\ (2+\lambda)}{2\left(-1+\alpha+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}\right)},$$

but the right hand side is equal to

$$\frac{(1-\lambda)\ (4+\lambda)}{2\left(-1+\alpha+(1+\lambda)^{2\,n}\right)},$$

which is positive for $0 < \lambda \equiv h\alpha < 1$.

When $\mathcal{N}_\Phi$ and $J^E(z_n)$ are written instead of $\mathcal{N}_\varphi$ and z_n, respectively, the considerations above remain valid, implying $b_n \leq J^E(z_n)$. $\square$

Remark 4.12 *Notice the subtle difference between the chain of inequalities (35) and (38). Unlike $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(a_n)$, quantity $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E(b_n)$ is not necessarily defined, since b_n may lie outside the domain of definition of $\mathcal{N}_\varphi^E$.* $\square$

Now, since $z_j < \omega_{\varphi,-} < 0$ and $J^E(z_j) < \omega_{\Phi,-} < 0$, by Lemma 4.1 we get that the right-hand side of (37) is at most

$$c \cdot h^{p+1} z_0^4 \prod_{j=1}^{n}\left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{2}\right) + c \cdot h^{p+1}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} z_i^4 \prod_{j=i+2}^{n}\left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{2}\right) \leq$$

$$c \cdot h^{p+1} z_0^4 + c \cdot h^{p+1}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} z_i^4 \left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-1-i}.$$

We will show that $h\sum_{i=0}^{n} z_i^4\left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i}$ is uniformly bounded for any $n \geq 0$, $0 < h \leq h_0$ and $0 < \alpha \leq \alpha_0$.

For $n \geq \lceil \frac{1}{h\alpha} \rceil$ and $i \geq n$, it is easy to see that $(1+h\alpha)^i \geq (1+h\alpha)^{\frac{1}{h\alpha}} \geq 1 + \frac{1}{h\alpha}\cdot h\alpha = 2$ implies $\frac{(1+h\alpha)^i}{\sqrt{\alpha-1+(1+h\alpha)^{2i}}} \leq 2$, hence by Lemma 4.11 we have

$$h\sum_{i=\lceil \frac{1}{h\alpha} \rceil}^{n} z_i^4\left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i} \leq h\sum_{i=\lceil \frac{1}{h\alpha} \rceil}^{n} b_i^4\left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i} \leq$$

$$16h\alpha^2\sum_{i=\lceil \frac{1}{h\alpha} \rceil}^{n}\left(\frac{(1+h\alpha)^i}{\sqrt{\alpha-1+(1+h\alpha)^{2i}}}\right)^4\left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i} \leq 256h\alpha^2\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^i = 512\alpha.$$

On the other hand, due to inequalities $e^{\frac{x}{2}} \leq 1+x$ $(x \in [0,1])$ and $1+x \leq e^x$ $(x \in \mathbb{R})$, for $n < \lceil \frac{1}{h\alpha} \rceil$ we have that

$$h\sum_{i=0}^{n} z_i^4 \left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i} \leq 16h\alpha^2 \sum_{i=0}^{n} \left(\frac{(1+h\alpha)^i}{\sqrt{\alpha-1+(1+h\alpha)^{2i}}}\right)^4 \left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i} \leq$$

$$16h\alpha^2 \sum_{i=0}^{n} \frac{e^{4h\alpha i}}{\left(\alpha-1+(1+h\alpha)^{2i}\right)^2} \cdot 1 \leq 874\, h\alpha^2 \sum_{i=0}^{n} \frac{1}{\left(\alpha-1+e^{h\alpha i}\right)^2}.$$

Set $g_{h,\alpha}(x) \equiv g(x) := \frac{h\alpha^2}{(\alpha-1+e^{h\alpha x})^2}$ for $x \in [0,\infty)$. Notice that g is bounded at $x=0$, and strictly decreasing on $[0,\infty)$, because

$$g'(x) = \frac{-2h^2\alpha^3 e^{h\alpha x}}{\left(\alpha-1+e^{h\alpha x}\right)^3} < 0.$$

So, since $0<\alpha<1$, we see that

$$874\, h\alpha^2 \sum_{i=0}^{n} \frac{1}{\left(\alpha-1+e^{h\alpha i}\right)^2} = 874h + 874\sum_{i=1}^{n} g_{h,\alpha}(i) \leq 874h + 874\int_0^{\frac{1}{h\alpha}} g_{h,\alpha}(x)\mathrm{d}x =$$

$$874h + 874\left[\frac{h\alpha^2 x}{(\alpha-1)^2} + \frac{\alpha}{(\alpha-1)\,(\alpha-1+e^{h\alpha x})} - \frac{\alpha\,\ln(\alpha-1+e^{h\alpha x})}{(\alpha-1)^2}\right]_{x=0}^{\frac{1}{h\alpha}} =$$

$$874h + 874\left(\frac{e-1+\alpha^2+\alpha\,(e-1+\alpha)\,(\ln\alpha - \ln(e-1+\alpha))}{(\alpha-1)^2\,(e-1+\alpha)}\right) \leq$$

$$874h + 874\cdot\frac{e-1+\alpha^2}{(\alpha-1)^2\,(e-1+\alpha)} \leq 874h + \frac{874}{(\alpha-1)^2} < 3584,$$

since $h \leq \frac{1}{10}$ and $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$, so $\alpha^2 \leq \alpha$.

Now combining all the estimates in the section, under assumption (33) and for $\alpha > 0$ we get that

$$\sup_{[z_0,\omega_{\varphi,_})} |id - J^E| = \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sup_{[z_n,z_{n+1}]} |id - J^E| \leq$$

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \max\left(c\cdot h^{p+1} z_0^4,\, c\cdot h^{p+1} z_0^4 + c\cdot h^{p+1}\sum_{i=0}^{n} z_i^4\left(1-\frac{h\alpha}{2}\right)^{n-i}\right) \leq$$

$$c\cdot h^{p+1} z_0^4 + c\cdot h^p\cdot(3584+512\alpha) \leq 3841c\cdot h^p.$$

Finally, a closeness estimate on $[z_0,0)$ for $\alpha \leq 0$ is proved. The proof of the next lemma is identical to its counterpart in the TC case.

Lemma 4.13 *Suppose that $\alpha \leq 0$ and assumption (33) hold. Then for any $0 < h \leq h_0$, $-\alpha_0 \leq \alpha \leq \beta \leq 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that*

$$0 > z_n(\alpha) \geq z_n(\beta).$$

So $0 > z_n(\alpha) \geq z_n(0)$ holds for $\alpha \leq 0$ and it is enough to give a lower estimate of $z_n(0)$.

Lemma 4.14 *Under assumption (33), we have for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that*

$$z_n(0) \geq z_0 \geq -\frac{1}{2K}$$

and for $n \geq \lfloor \frac{16K^2}{h} \rfloor$

$$z_n(0) \geq -\frac{2}{\sqrt{nh}}.$$

Proof. Monotonicity of the sequence $z_n(0)$ and (33) imply the first part. The nontrivial second inequality is proved by induction. Since $z_{\lfloor \frac{16K^2}{h} \rfloor}(0) \geq -\frac{1}{2K} = -\frac{2}{\sqrt{16K^2}} \geq -\frac{2}{\sqrt{h\lfloor \frac{16K^2}{h} \rfloor}}$, the induction can be started. So suppose that $n \geq \lfloor \frac{16K^2}{h} \rfloor$. The function $z \mapsto \mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, z, 0)$ is increasing, so, by the induction hypothesis we have that $z_{n+1}(0) = \mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, z_n(0), 0) \geq \mathcal{N}_\varphi\left(h, -\frac{2}{\sqrt{nh}}, 0\right)$. It is enough to show that $\mathcal{N}_\varphi\left(h, -\frac{2}{\sqrt{nh}}, 0\right) \geq -\frac{2}{\sqrt{(n+1)h}}$. Multiplying this by $\sqrt{h}$ and rearranging, it suffices to prove

$$\frac{4}{n\sqrt{n}} + \frac{8\widetilde{\eta}_4}{n^2\sqrt{h}} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}},$$

where is $\widetilde{\eta}_4$ from (31). But $\frac{1}{2n\sqrt{n}} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n+1}}$, so it is enough to verify $4 + \frac{8\widetilde{\eta}_4}{\sqrt{nh}} \geq \frac{1}{2}$: it is easy to see that conditions $n \geq \lfloor \frac{16K^2}{h} \rfloor \geq \frac{16K^2}{h} - 1$ and $h \leq 8K^2$ (from (33)) together with the definition of K imply $\left|\frac{8\widetilde{\eta}_4}{\sqrt{nh}}\right| \leq 3$. $\square$

Then we can simply estimate (37) for $\alpha \leq 0$ as follows. Supposing that $n \geq 1$ we get that

$$\sup_{[z_n, z_{n+1}]} |id - J^E| \leq c \cdot h^{p+1} z_0^4 \prod_{j=1}^{n} \left(1 + h\alpha - \frac{5}{2} h \max\left(z_j, J^E(z_j)\right)^2\right) +$$

$$c \cdot h^{p+1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} z_i^4 \prod_{j=i+2}^{n} \left(1 + h\alpha - \frac{5}{2} h \max\left(z_j, J^E(z_j)\right)^2\right) \leq$$

$$c \cdot h^{p+1} z_0^4 \cdot 1 + c \cdot h^p \cdot h \sum_{i=0}^{n} z_i(0)^4 \cdot 1 \leq$$

$$c \cdot h^p \left(h z_0^4 + h \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{16K^2}{h} \rfloor} z_i(0)^4 + h \sum_{i=\lfloor \frac{16K^2}{h} \rfloor + 1}^{n} z_i(0)^4 \right),$$

where, of course, for $n \leq \lfloor \frac{16K^2}{h} \rfloor$, the sum above $\sum_{i=\lfloor \frac{16K^2}{h} \rfloor + 1}^{n}$ is not present. But

$$h \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{16K^2}{h} \rfloor} z_i(0)^4 \leq h \cdot \left(\frac{16K^2}{h} + 1\right) \left(-\frac{1}{2K}\right)^4 \leq \frac{2}{K^2}$$

by $h \leq 8K^2$, and

$$h \sum_{i=\lfloor \frac{16K^2}{h} \rfloor + 1}^{n} z_i(0)^4 \leq h \sum_{i=\lfloor \frac{16K^2}{h} \rfloor + 1}^{n} \frac{16}{i^2 h^2} \leq \frac{16}{h} \int_{\frac{16K^2}{h}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^2} = \frac{1}{K^2}.$$

We have thus proved that

$$\sup_{[z_0, 0)} |id - J^E| \leq c \cdot h^{p+1} z_0^4 + c \cdot h^p \left(h z_0^4 + \frac{3}{K^2}\right) \leq c \left(2 + \frac{3}{K^2}\right) h^p.$$

5 A numerical example and some open questions

In this section we present a TC model example to illustrate the transformations in Lemma 2.4 and Theorem 2.5, and to show how they are connected to the estimate in Theorem 2.6. Finally we also highlight some issues regarding possible generalizations of Theorems 2.6 or 2.16 to higher dimensions.

Let us consider the two-dimensional system

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = & \alpha x(t) + x^2(t) \\ \dot{y}(t) = & -y(t) \end{cases} \tag{39}$$

undergoing a transcritical bifurcation at $\alpha = 0$. By solving (39), we see that the time-h-map of the exact solution flow (Φ, Ψ) can be written as

$$\Phi(h, x_0, \alpha) = \begin{cases} \frac{x_0 \alpha e^{\alpha h}}{\alpha + x_0(1 - e^{\alpha h})} & \text{for } \alpha \neq 0 \\ \frac{x_0}{1 - h x_0} & \text{for } \alpha = 0 \end{cases} \tag{40}$$

and

$$\Psi(h, y_0, \alpha) = y_0 e^{-h}$$

for any $h \geq 0$, $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the denominators are non-zero. Let us apply the classical 4^{th}-order Runge–Kutta method with (some small enough) step-size $h > 0$ to (39); hence from now on the value of h is fixed. Then the corresponding discretization map (φ, ψ) takes the form

$$\varphi(h, x_0, \alpha) = \left(1 + \alpha h + \frac{\alpha^2 h^2}{2} + \frac{\alpha^3 h^3}{6} + \frac{\alpha^4 h^4}{24}\right) x_0 + \left(h + \frac{3\alpha h^2}{2} + \ldots + \frac{\alpha^6 h^7}{96}\right) x_0^2 + \ldots + \frac{h^{15}}{24576} x_0^{16} \tag{41}$$

(with intermediate terms suppressed) and $\psi(h, y_0, \alpha) = \left(1 - h + \frac{h^2}{2} - \frac{h^3}{6} + \frac{h^4}{24}\right) y_0$. By using the semi-group property of the flow, the n-fold iterate ($n \in \mathbb{N}$) of Φ is given by $\left(\Phi(h, \cdot, \alpha)\right)^{[n]}(x_0) = \Phi(nh, x_0, \alpha)$, and an analogous formula holds for Ψ. Figure 5 depicts some iterates

$$\left(\Phi\left(n \cdot \frac{1}{100}, x_0, 1\right), \Psi\left(n \cdot \frac{1}{100}, y_0, 1\right)\right)$$

for various initial values (x_0, y_0) and for $0 \leq n \leq 600$. Due to the fact that the system (39) is already decoupled, the center manifolds both for the time-h-map (corresponding to the fixed point $(0, 0)$) and for the discretization map can be identified with $\mathbb{R}$ for any α, see [8]. Moreover, the restriction of the time-h-map and the discretization map to this center manifold can be chosen as Φ and φ, respectively. According to Remark 2.3, the map φ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2.6 with $p = 4$.

The qualitative part of Theorem 2.6—that is, the existence of a conjugacy—implies that the phase portraits induced by the restricted maps Φ and φ near the bifurcation point $(\alpha_0, x_0) = (0, 0)$ are topologically the same, and they are both similar to the portrait depicted in Figure 3.

On the other hand, due to the construction of J presented in Section 3.1, the quantitative part of Theorem 2.6—that is, the estimate (14)—expresses the fact that the orbit of a point x_0 under the normal form $\mathcal{N}_\Phi$ and that of under $\mathcal{N}_\varphi$ are uniformly close to each other. Let us elaborate on this closeness relation. We notice that $\left(\mathcal{N}_\Phi(h, \cdot, \alpha)\right)^{[n]}(x_0)$ and $\left(\mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, \cdot, \alpha)\right)^{[n]}(x_0)$

both converge to the appropriate fixed points as $n \to +\infty$, for any $x_0 \le 0$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ close to 0, see Figure 3. By defining the "normalized difference"

$$\delta(h, x_0, \alpha, n) := \frac{1}{h^p} \left| (\mathcal{N}_\Phi(h, \cdot, \alpha))^{[n]}(x_0) - (\mathcal{N}_\varphi(h, \cdot, \alpha))^{[n]}(x_0) \right| \tag{42}$$

with $p = 4$, the uniform closeness of the orbits means that there are constants $const > 0$, $h_0 > 0$, $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and $\alpha_0 > 0$ (depending on the right-hand side of (39) and on the chosen discretization method) such that

$$\sup_{h \in (0, h_0]} \sup_{x_0 \in [-\varepsilon_0, 0]} \sup_{\alpha \in [-\alpha_0, \alpha_0]} \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \delta(h, x_0, \alpha, n) \le const. \tag{43}$$

(For $x_0 \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, one uses the iterates of the inverses of the normal forms in the definition of δ in (42).)

When casting the above closeness relation in terms of the maps Φ and φ instead of the normal forms $\mathcal{N}_\Phi$ and $\mathcal{N}_\varphi$, it should be emphasized that it is not the orbits $\{(\Phi(h, \cdot, \alpha))^{[n]}(x_0) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{(\varphi(h, \cdot, \alpha))^{[n]}(x_0) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ that are compared. While the step-size h is the same in both cases, the initial value x_0 and the bifurcation parameter α for (say) the numerical orbit generally have to be slightly adjusted to have uniform closeness between the orbits (see also [1], [4] or [12, Section 2.1]). In other words, we prove uniform closeness between the corresponding members of the sequences $\{(\Phi(h, \cdot, \alpha))^{[n]}(x_0) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{(\varphi(h, \cdot, \widetilde{\alpha}))^{[n]}(\widetilde{x}_0) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $\widetilde{x}_0$ and $\widetilde{\alpha}$ are chosen suitably, close to x_0 and α, respectively. (We remark that the choice of $\widetilde{x}_0$ and $\widetilde{\alpha}$ is in general not unique.) The normal form transformations in Lemma 2.4 and Theorem 2.5 are preparatory conjugacies, preceding the construction of the main conjugacy J, that provide us with suitable pairings $x_0 \leftrightarrow \widetilde{x}_0$ and $\alpha \leftrightarrow \widetilde{\alpha}$. In the present example, these preparatory conjugacies transform (40) into (19), and (41) into (20). Notice that in general the normal forms have better closeness properties (21) than the original maps (3). By considering the proofs of Lemma 2.4 and Theorem 2.5 as given in [10], one can explicitly give a formula for $\widetilde{x}_0$ and $\widetilde{\alpha}$: by inverting the normal form transformations, we get from (43) that

$$\frac{1}{h^p} \left| (\Phi(h, \cdot, \alpha))^{[n]}(x_0) - \frac{1}{\varrho(h, \alpha)} \cdot (\varphi(h, \cdot, \widetilde{\alpha}(h, \alpha)))^{[n]}(\varrho(h, \alpha) \cdot x_0) \right| \tag{44}$$

is uniformly bounded in $h \in (0, h_0]$, $x_0 \in [-\varepsilon_0, 0]$, $\alpha \in [-\alpha_0, \alpha_0]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The functions ϱ and $\widetilde{\alpha}$ can explicitly be expressed in terms of the (inverse functions of some of the) multivariate series expansion coefficient functions of Φ and φ, and we have $\varrho(h, \alpha) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(h^p)$ and $\widetilde{\alpha}(h, \alpha) = \alpha + \mathcal{O}(h^p)$. In our model example (40)–(41), the functions ϱ and $\widetilde{\alpha}$ contain the exponential function and one root of a quartic polynomial (depending on h and α). For simplicity, instead of reproducing the exact formulae, here we only give the first few terms of their series expansion as

$$\varrho(h, \alpha) = 1 + \frac{1}{20}\alpha^4 h^4 - \frac{5}{96}\alpha^5 h^5 + \mathcal{O}\left((\alpha h)^6\right)$$

and

$$\widetilde{\alpha}(h, \alpha) = \alpha \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{120}\alpha^4 h^4 - \frac{1}{144}\alpha^5 h^5 + \mathcal{O}\left((\alpha h)^6\right)\right).$$

Figure 6 shows the normalized distance (44) with Φ and φ given by (40) and (41), $h = \frac{1}{1000}$, $\alpha = -\frac{1}{2}$, $x_0 = -1$ and $p = 4$ for $0 \le n \le 3000$. To illustrate the sensitivity of (44) with respect to perturbations, Figure 7 depicts (44) with the same Φ, φ, h, α, x_0 and p, but instead of $\varphi(h, \cdot, \widetilde{\alpha}(h, \alpha))$, the map $\varphi(h, \cdot, \widetilde{\alpha}(h, \alpha) + 10^{-7})$ is iterated: compare the vertical scale of Figure 6 with that of Figure 7.



Figure 5: Some iterates of the form $(\Phi(nh, x_0, \alpha), \Psi(nh, y_0, \alpha))$ corresponding to the time-h-map of (39) with $h = 1/100$ and $\alpha = 1$ and started from various initial values (x_0, y_0) show the convergence of the trajectories to the stable fixed point.



Figure 6: The normalized difference (44) is graphed with $h = 1/1000$, $\alpha = -1/2$ and $x_0 = -1$.

Remark 5.1 *In [2] and [9], conjugacy results are proved in the vicinity of a fold bifurcation point in higher dimensions. Both papers show the existence of a conjugacy between* $\Phi(1, \cdot, \alpha)$—



Figure 7: Perturbing the value of $\widetilde{\alpha}$ in (44) just by 10^{-7} (and keeping the same h, α and x_0 values as in Figure 6) results in a huge increase in the maximum value of (44).

i.e., the time-1-map of the exact solution operator—and its numerical approximation

$$(\varphi(1/N, \cdot, \widetilde{\alpha}))^{[N]}$$

(with $N \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large). Based on these results it is natural to conjecture that the existence of a conjugacy between the time-h-map of the exact flow and its numerical approximation can be proved near a TC or a PF bifurcation point in higher dimensions as well.

However, it is not clear a priori whether it is possible to prove closeness results between the conjugacy and the identity, or what the optimal order $\mathcal{O}(h^q)$ of a closeness estimate near a TC or PF point would be—one should take into account that in general the center manifolds corresponding to the continuous and discrete systems do not coincide. We remark that neither [2] nor [9] contains any closeness results near a fold bifurcation point. As we pointed out in [5], the symmetry argument in [2] used in the announced $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$ estimate on the center manifold breaks down, hence that closeness result cannot be considered as proved: as we mentioned in the introduction of the present paper, the optimal form of the fold closeness estimate is still an open question even in one dimension. □

References

[1] W.-J. Beyn, *On the numerical approximation of phase portraits near stationary points*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **24**, No. 5 (1987), 1095–1113.

[2] Gy. Farkas, *Conjugacy in the discretized fold bifurcation*, Comput. Math. Appl. **43**, No. 8–9 (2002), 1027–1033.

[3] A. Foster, M. Khumalo, *Transformation of local bifurcations under collocation methods*, J. Korean Math. Soc. **48**, No. 6 (2011), 1101–1123.

[4] B. M. Garay, *Discretization and some qualitative properties of ordinary differential equations about equilibria*, Acta Math. Univ. Comenian. (N.S.) **62**, No. 2 (1993), 249–275.

[5] B. M. Garay, L. Lóczi, *Discretizing the fold bifurcation—a conjugacy result*, Per. Math. Hungarica **56**, No. 1 (2008), 37–53.

[6] P. Glendinning, *Stability, Instability and Chaos*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1994.

[7] T. Hüls, *A model function for polynomial rates in discrete dynamical systems*, Appl. Math. Lett. **17**, No. 1 (2004), 1–5.

[8] Y. A. Kuznetsov, *Elements of Applied Bifurcation Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.

[9] M. C. Li, *Stability of a saddle node bifurcation under numerical approximations*, Comput. Math. Appl. **49**, No. 11–12 (2005), 1849–1852.

[10] L. Lóczi, *Discretizing Elementary Bifurcations*, PhD Thesis, Budapest University of Technology, 2006.

[11] J. Páez Chávez, L. Lóczi, *Various Closeness Results in Discretized Bifurcations*, Differ. Equ. Dyn. Syst. **20**, No. 3 (2012), 235–284.

[12] A. M. Stuart, *Numerical analysis of dynamical systems*, Acta Numerica (1994), 467–572.

[13] S. Wiggins, *Introduction to Applied Nonlinear Dynamical Systems and Chaos*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.